Vol. LV. No. 5 November, 1916

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

AMERICAN PRIESTS AND FOREIGN MISSIONS 477
The Rev. ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana.
OLD CHURCHYARDS: THEIR SECULAR SIDE 488
JOHN R. FRYAR, Canterbury, England.
THE PRIESTLY TEMPERAMENT 501
The Rev. WILLIAM J. KERBY, Ph.D., Catholic University of America.
OUR SEMINARIES 516
The Very Rev. JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C., Ph.D., Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.
THE PERSONIFICATION OF LAW 529
The Very Rev. JAMES C. BYRNE, V.G., St. Paul, Minnesota.
THE MORALITY OF ANTI-CONCEPTIVE DEVICES 535
The Rev. T. SLATER, S.J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales.
SPARE TIME OF PRIESTS 555
The Right Rev. Monsignor FRANCIS C. KELLEY, D. D., LL.D., Chicago, Illinois.
SPONSORS AT BAPTISM 562
SECULARIZED RELIGIOUS AND DIOCESAN OFFICES 562
QUESTION OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY 563
THE ORDO IN A HOSPITAL CHAPEL 564
MILITARY MASS IN A PARISH 567
THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE AUTOMOBILE 568
DISTINGUO
THE PRIEST AND THE AUTOMOBILE 569
TUTO
THE PORTIUNCULA INDULGENCE 570
RECENT BIBLE STUDY: Harvard Christologies. 5 573
The Rev. WALTER DRUM, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1916: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press
Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $3.50; Foreign, 15 shillings ($3.65)
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P. Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

St. Bernard's Seminary O-Neh-Da Vineyard

ALTAR WINE

ON account of the increased cost of labor and of materials used in shipping Altar Wines and of a recently imposed government tax we find it necessary to revise our prices as indicated below. We take occasion to call attention to the reliability of the wine and to its superior qualities. The wine is made according to the rules of the Church **under the personal supervision of the Right Reverend Thomas F. Hickey, Bishop of Rochester, who gives his guarantee to the purity of the wine.** It is both licit and valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Revised List—Spring of 1916

GRADES AND PRICES

Ordinary Altar Wine, made from Concord, Catawba and Worden grapes,
Bottled, 5 gallons in 25 bottles ..... $ 8.00
In bulk, 1 keg 10 gallons. 12.50
In bulk, 1 keg 23½ gallons..... 27.00
In bulk, 1 barrel 46 gallons 50.00

Elvira Altar Wine, made exclusively from the Elvira grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 9.00

Superior Altar Wine, made exclusively from Delaware, Brighton or Salem grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 16.00

War Tax Additional. **No Dealer has this Wine for sale.**
Kindly advise method of transportation—Freight or express.

Address all communications to REV. M. J. NOLAN, Chancellor, 72 Frank Street, Rochester, N. Y.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

L'Admirable $6.25 per dozen

Novitiate $5.00 per dozen

Malvoisie $4.00 per dozen

Villa Joseph $4.00 per dozen

War Tax Additional

(COPY)

SACRED HEART NOVITIATE
Los Gatos, Cal., January 3rd, 1916.

THE BARNSTON TEA COMPANY, 6 Barclay Street, New York City.

Gentlemen: It is with pleasure that, looking over our books, we observe that during the year 1915, we have shipped you in sealed cars, the following quantities of our altar wines:

13,252 Gallons ..... Sweet Novitiate
6,012½ Gallons ..... Villa Joseph
3,843 Gallons ..... Malvoisie
103 Gallons ..... L'Admirable

We take the present opportunity to thank you for your conscientious and painstaking efforts made in handling our wines, the results of which are so gratifying.

For the coming year we have the greatest hopes; we have in our wineries an abundance of excellent wines, made by our own brothers and whose absolute purity we can therefore guarantee. Should your requirements for the coming year double or triple those of last year, we are confident that we can meet them.

Thanking you once more for your efforts made in selling our wines, and wishing you every success during the ensuing year, we desire to remain,

Yours very sincerely, THE SACRED HEART NOVITIATE,

John P. Madden, S.J.

Treasurer

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.

Established 1870

FORTY-FIVE YEARS AS DEALERS IN VALID AND LICIT

Altar Wines

The Donnelly Brothers

respectfully call attention to their popular Altar Wines, popular because of their proven purity and agreeableness for use when fasting.

"Collegiate," "San Patricio,"
"Jurancon," "Vin de Tours,"
and "Pureza."

Satisfaction guaranteed. A trial order solicited.

THE DONNELLY BROTHERS
TROY, N. Y.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:

Decernitur quae intercedere debeant Rationes tum Pontificio Instituto Biblico, tum Pontificio Consilio Vulgatae restituendae, cum Supremo Pontificio Consilio Rei Biblicae provehendae 544

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII:

I. Instructio super Casuum Conscientiae Reservationibus 548
II. De Adsistentia Passiva Parochorum in Matrimoniis Mixtis 550
III. Plura solvuntur Dubia circa Indulgentias a Tertiariis Saecularibus Ordinis Minorum lucrandas 551

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS:

Westmonasteriensis et Nortantoniensis: Dismembrationis et Unionis. 553

ROMAN CURIA:

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments 553

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 555
Spare Time of Priests. (*The Right Rev. Monsignor Francis C. Kelley, D. D., LL.D., Chicago, Illinois*) 555
Sponsors at Baptism 562
Secularized Religious and Diocesan Offices 562
Question of Papal Infallibility. (*An Obstinate Junior*) 563
The Ordo in a Hospital Chapel 564
Military Mass in a Parish 567
The Philosopher and the Automobile. (*Distinguo*) 568
The Priest and the Automobile. (*Tuto*) 569
The Portiuncula Indulgence 570
Sugar in Altar Wine 572

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study: Harvard Christologies. 5. Dr. Royce and the Beloved Community. (*The Rev. Walter Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.*) 572

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Kirkfleet: History of St. Norbert 585
D'Ales: Lumen Vitae 586
Schumacher: Christus in seiner Praeexistenz und Kenose 587
Searle: The Truth about Christian Science 588
Betten: The Ancient World 589
Walling et al.: The Socialism of To-day 591
Graham: Bernal Diaz del Castillo 593
Hollingworth: Vocational Psychology 599

LITERARY CHAT 601

BOOKS RECEIVED 604

ENRICH YOUR LIBRARY

WITH A

SET OF THE REVIEW

OF RECENT MONTHS there has been quite a brisk turn-over of back copies of the REVIEW. We have been advertising for some numbers to help complete the files of some of our subscribers, and they are still in search of other back copies. If you need some back copies or volumes, or if you have them to dispose of, now is the time to write.

✣ ✣ ✣ ✣

The increased activity in this department is doubtless due to the publication of the INDEX of the first fifty volumes of the REVIEW. The INDEX has proved itself a most useful volume, both for those who have all the volumes of the REVIEW and those who have only a few volumes. Subscribers who have not yet got a copy of the INDEX can procure one ($3.00 postpaid).

✣ ✣ ✣ ✣

Priests who want early volumes of the magazine will do well to send in their requisition without delay. It is impossible to say from day to day what copies or volumes we shall have on hand to-morrow. At this writing we may have the numbers your set lacks or we may be able to get the missing copies for you. Let us know what you need or what numbers you wish to dispose of.

✣ ✣ ✣ ✣

Start to build your set of REVIEW now. It has been a pleasure to us to help complete the sets of several of our subscribers, and we shall gladly try to do it for you. What more valuable for a priest's library than a set of the volumes of the REVIEW ?

TO-DAY, SEND FOR BACK COPIES, AND INDEX

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. V.—(LV).—NOVEMBER, 1916.—NO. 5.

AMERICAN PRIESTS AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Behold, I say to you, lift up your eyes, and see the countries; for they are white already to harvest.—*John 4: 35.*

And seeing the multitudes, He had compassion on them: because they were distressed, and lying like sheep that have no shepherd.—*Matt. 9: 36.*

Every member of the Catholic and Apostolic Church ought to consider it an honor and a glory to be included in the sublime commission to labor for the conversion of pagan nations.—*Cardinal Wiseman.*

THE average American priest, and especially the native-born cleric racy of the soil, would probably resent as a downright calumny the imputation that he is narrow, circumscribed in his views, illiberal in his sympathies, and parochial in his activities. With not a little complacency, and with more or less justice, he is apt to consider himself quite the reverse of all this. If he does not exactly plume himself on his notable breadth of view, his widespread interest, his large-hearted tolerance, and his unselfish generosity, he is at least free from any consciousness that he lacks these qualities, and is accordingly fairly well satisfied with his attitude toward his friends and acquaintances and the world in general. Whether or not that satisfaction is really warranted is a question the discussion of which in these pages would perhaps be more futile than fruitful; but there can be nothing offensive in the suggestion that our average American priest may profitably examine just how much broad-mindedness, interest, sympathy, and generosity he habitually displays in connexion with the Church's Foreign Missions.

Such an examination is peculiarly timely at present, because of the altered conditions of the Missions and their sources of supply since the outbreak of the European War. For the past two years the Catholic press in all lands of both hemispheres

has repeatedly called attention to a fact the obviousness of which might be supposed to render iteration superfluous: that the upkeep and the progress of the Foreign Missions for the next decade or so will be dependent, principally, on the aid received from America. No reader of this REVIEW needs to be told why this is the case. The dearth of men and money in those lands which have heretofore been the mainstay of the Church's evangelizing forces in pagan countries is an outstanding and lamentable fact of contemporary history; and it is more than probable that the dearth will for some years survive the conclusion of the war that has brought it about. The urgent need of America's assistance is accordingly manifest.

As for the congruity, not to say the duty, of furnishing that assistance, no elaborate argument would seem to be necessary to convince any thoughtful cleric that the Foreign Missions have a quasi-right to expect American Catholics to contribute generously to their subsistence. When Our Saviour said to His Apostles. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: . . . and behold I am with you all days even to the end of the world", He evidently laid upon His Church a charge that was to endure as long as there remain on earth heathens to be evangelized. This apostolic commission is addressed to the Church of to-day not less forcibly than to that of the first century, and to the Church in America not less directly than to the Church in France, Belgium, Italy, or Spain. The work of actually preaching and baptizing belongs of course to the missionary priests; but, as Cardinal Wiseman declared some sixty years ago, "Certainly the whole Church—including, therefore, the laity—have their part in this solemn duty: the Apostles themselves collected the alms of the first faithful, to enable themselves to carry it out."

In a general way, then, the obligation of the Catholic clergy and laity of this country to do their part in the evangelization of the heathen is acknowledged by all priests: the desideratum is that it should be avowed and discharged in a specific way by the individual pastor. The old adage that what is everybody's business is nobody's business is verified all too frequently in these United States when there is question of

aiding the Foreign Missions. Not of course that there are not many priests who are acquitting themselves of their full duty in this matter; but it is probably true to say that such priests are the exception rather than the rule. If the *average* priest were as zealous in this good work as is the exceptional one, it is safe to assert that the financial contributions to the Missions would be increased by several hundred per cent. Is it not worth while for this average priest to take thought of his personal responsibility in the matter, and visualize the various practicable methods by which he may acquit himself of his individual, proportional share of an obligation certainly incumbent upon the American Catholic body as a whole?

As has been said, our Foreign Missions are at present, and for some years to come are likely to be, in urgent need of men and money. In the mind of the present writer, there is no parish priest in the United States who, with a little goodwill, cannot materially help in supplying them with both. As between the two requisites, while the first, men, is the more essential and in the long run absolutely indispensable, the second, money, is almost equally necessary and is far more speedily available. Pretermitting for the moment any consideration of the priest's effective activity in increasing the number of missionaries in the foreign field, let us see how he may augment the resources of the actual workers in that field.

The simplest and the most direct method by which a pastor may lessen the burden of financial worry habitually borne by the foreign missionary is to organize in his parish branches of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Association of the Holy Childhood. The former organization, as most readers of this REVIEW are doubtless aware, is an international association the purpose of which is to assist by prayers and alms Catholic missionary priests, Brothers, and Sisters engaged in spreading the Gospel in heathen and non-Catholic countries. Conditions of membership are of the simplest: the recitation of a daily prayer for the missions and a contribution of at least five cents monthly to the general fund. The ordinary method for gathering the contributions is to form the associates into bands of ten, of whom one acts as promoter. These promoters turn over the offerings to a local or diocesan director by whom they are forwarded to the general com-

mittee. Personal contributors of six dollars a year are called special members, while the offering at one time of at least forty dollars makes one a perpetual member. As for the Association of the Holy Childhood, membership therein entails on the part of children a monthly contribution of one cent, or a yearly one of twelve cents, and the daily recitation of a "Hail Mary", with the addition, "Holy Virgin Mary, pray for us and for the poor pagan children." Should any clerical financier be inclined to smile at the disproportion between a cent a month and any worth-while assistance to the Foreign Missions, an effective check to his mirth is afforded by the statement that some seven million children are enrolled in the Association, and that since its foundation in 1843 it has given to the Missions fully thirty-two million dollars and saved to the Church about eighteen million pagan children.

A graphic illustration of the intimate relation between financial contributions to the Missions and conversions of heathens is presented in the remark of a missionary priest in Hyderabad (Hindustan) to Father Hull, S.J., editor of the Bombay *Examiner*: "Give me twenty-four dollars, and in a year I'll give you five hundred Christians. How? Quite simply: that sum will pay a catechist for a year, in which time he can instruct five hundred who are asking for baptism." An additional incentive to priestly activity in securing funds for so excellent a purpose is the knowledge that Protestants are thoroughly alive to the relation we have mentioned, that between money and conversions. A recent report of the United States branch of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, after stating that two-thirds of the Foreign Missions' revenue has been cut off by the war, adds: "To make matters worse, Protestant missionaries, who are at all times one of the most powerful obstacles to the planting of the true Christian Faith, are increasing their efforts to supplant our priests and to take up the work which the latter may have to abandon for lack of resources. The receipts of the Protestant Boards of Foreign Missions are larger than ever, and their activity abroad is increased in proportion." A pertinent commentary on the foregoing is the fact, vouched for by a Catholic journal of India, that Protestants made about as many converts in that country in one century, the nineteenth, as it took Catholics

four centuries to reach, the adequate explanation being: "They have greater resources and utilize them".

To return from this quasi-digression to the average American priest's attitude toward these societies that directly aid the Foreign Missions: what genuine obstacle prevents him from establishing in his parish branches of both the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Association of the Holy Childhood? Does he allege the multiplicity of home needs and the difficulty of providing for the upkeep of his own "plant"—church, rectory, school, hall, etc.? If so, he is not only over-emphasizing the adage, "Well-ordered charity begins at home" and showing himself less broad-minded and large-hearted than is congruous in a zealous priest of God, but is advocating what is really a short-sighted policy calculated to increase, rather than diminish, his financial difficulties. "Give and it shall be given unto you" is one of the first principles of Gospel prudence and his preaching it to his people by word and example will undoubtedly be productive of more beneficent results, even from a material standpoint, than will any narrow insistence on the dictum about the charity that begins at home—and all too often stays there.

The experience of all those priests who interest themselves and their parishioners in these societies which we have mentioned may safely be appealed to in support of the contention that, far from affecting unfavorably purely local religious or charitable works, affiliation with the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Association of the Holy Childhood stimulates the generosity of the faithful and actually increases the revenues for home needs. As a Pennsylvania cleric has admirably put it in a letter to a missionary magazine: "That our parishes would never suffer from an increased zeal in the broader interests of the Universal Church is a consoling paradox which it is well to emphasize. It is not a question of jealously husbanding resources; it is rather a question of arousing in the hearts of our people that unfathomable religious spirit which is too often allowed to lie dormant—that spirit which measures its generosity not by the size of another's contribution, but by the unlimited extent of the need. . . . It is a splendid object-lesson for us parish priests that the ecclesiastic who was most closely identified with foreign

mission work in England, was the man who built the Westminster Cathedral, who saved the day for religious schools in Parliament, and who organized the admirable system of child-rescue work that will continue to prove its excellence for years to come."

One consideration which should possess not a little weight in determining both a pastor and his people to show themselves generous in aiding the Society for the Propagation of the Faith is that they themselves, as constituent members of the Church in this country, have received very substantial benefits from that organization. Writing to its directors in the name of the American hierarchy assembled at Baltimore for the third national Council, in 1884, Cardinal Gibbons said. "If the grain of mustard seed planted in the virgin soil of America has struck deep roots and grown into a gigantic tree, with branches stretching from the shores of the Atlantic ocean to the coasts of the Pacific, it is mainly to the assistance rendered by your admirable Society that we are indebted for this blessing." That this tribute is not mere poetic hyperbole but simple prosaic fact is clear from Mgr. Freri's tabulated statement of the Society's receipts and disbursements, contributed to the *Catholic Encyclopedia.* There we find that, up to 1910, inclusively, while the United States has given to the Society two and three-quarter million dollars, the Society has given to missions in America seven and three-quarter millions. Now that this country has graduated from the ranks of missionary lands (although seventeen dioceses in the South and the Far West still receive yearly allocations from the Society), it is surely fitting that our priests and people should do their part in paying off that debt. And if the pastors take the initiative, it is morally certain that the flocks will readily lend their coöperation.

It need hardly be stated that, apart from any affiliation with these foreign mission societies, a zealous priest who is big enough to think in terms of the universal Church can effectively aid the missions by his personal contributions to particular projects that make a specific appeal to his sympathy, and by enlisting the active interest of his wealthy or at least well-to-do friends for the same good cause. He can moreover infuse genuine warmth and earnestness into his appeal to his

people to make the collection for the Missions a notably generous sum, not an insignificant pittance.

Financial assistance, however, even the most liberal and bounteous assistance, is neither the sole need of the Foreign Missions in our day nor the only way in which the Church in America can manifest her apostolic spirit in their regard. Lack of money undoubtedly handicaps the activities of the missionaries and is a misfortune; but a dearth of missionaries paralyzes the work of evangelization and is a disaster. Funds for the workers in the foreign field cannot but be regarded as an urgent need; additional workers in that field may well be looked upon as an absolute necessity. And to supply the requisite men is obviously a much more difficult matter than to furnish even abundant money. Thorough-going zeal on the part of a parish priest who is imbued with a genuinely apostolic spirit can speedily amass some hundreds of dollars for missionary use; but to provide a priest or Brother or Sister who will go to the field afar to devote life's energies to apostolic work is an achievement measurably harder and notably less expeditious.

Once we grant the necessity of an end, however, reasonable trust in Divine Providence assures us that means for the successful accomplishment of that end can invariably be found by men of good will. If American missionaries are needed in Asia, Africa, and the Southern Seas, as they undoubtedly are, then there are, just as undoubtedly, ways and methods by which American boys and girls in sufficient numbers can be inspired with love for such a vocation and trained for the work which it necessarily entails. That a beginning has already been made, at Maryknoll, in the matter of providing American priests for the foreign missions is both a cause for legitimate pride on the part of the zealous promoters of that excellent work, and a proof that no insuperable difficulties lie in the way of America's doing her full duty with respect to Christ's commission, " Going, therefore, teach ye all nations ". Even a partial fulfilment of that duty will, however, necessitate during the next few decades the establishment of more than two or three such seminaries as Maryknoll in different parts of this great and still growing country; and there is no parish priest in the land so overburdened with work or so

straitened in resources that he may not render effective aid, both in furthering the prosperity of the institution at Ossining, N. Y., and in fostering vocations that will justify the founding of several similar institutions.

That vocations to the Foreign Missions are in this country at present sporadic, exceptional, few and far between, will scarcely be contested by any one whose interest in the subject has led him to make inquiries; that their existence in fairly large numbers should become in the near future a normal outgrowth of the religious education imparted to our young people is a consummation not only devoutly to be wished, but, at least in the opinion of the present writer, entirely feasible, not to say comparatively easy to bring about. To speak first of the sporadic vocations existing here and there throughout the land, and the pastor's duty in connexion therewith: young Catholics whom the grace of God is calling to a life of consecration and self-sacrifice have a quasi-right to learn from their parish priests that at Maryknoll, at Techny (Illinois), and in various religious orders and congregations of the country, opportunities are afforded for the development of their vocation, for a training specifically designed to fit them for apostolic work in foreign fields. Nor will it argue very extraordinary zeal on the part of a pastor if, in a given case, he financially assists the aspirant to such a life in reaching the goal of his pious ambition. A little more generous employment, by the average priest, of good advice and material aid, of the pious word and the helping hand, would very probably, even now, multiply fourfold the youthful Americans making ready for the glorious work of spreading Christ's Gospel in heathen lands.

The exigencies of the time, however, call for something more than these relatively rare and exceptional and scattered vocations; what is imperatively needed is a measurably numerous band of youthful volunteers issuing from Catholic schools and colleges with the resolute desire to work for God where God is unknown. How can such a band, constantly increasing as the years go by, be brought into existence? By precisely the same means as have proved effective in other lands—in Ireland, France, and Belgium, to mention no others. The supernatural atmosphere must be imbibed by our young folk more

habitually and in larger draughts than is the case at present. They must be taught from their earliest years that whole-hearted labor in the Lord's vineyard wherever situated, endurance of trials and sufferings for God's sake, holiness, sanctity, the desire of martyrdom even, are not abnormal manifestations of genuine Catholic life, nor mere ideals so lofty as to be unattainable by themselves. They must learn, as they *will* learn if properly instructed, to walk by faith rather than by sight, to discern the action of Providence, not the intervention of blind chance, in the various circumstances of their own lives, as in the bigger concerns of the world around them. They must in a word be thoroughly imbued with the idea that the things of eternity are after all the only things of supreme import to men and women young or old.

To become somewhat more specific: vocations to the Foreign Missions will abound in this country if our Catholic educators and our parish priests make due account of the spirit of romance and adventure and hero-worship which in some degree is found in all boys, and which in most boys exists in a notable degree. This spirit is naturally developed and fostered by the literature especially designed for the young—tales of exciting adventure, of discovery and exploration, of martial glories and naval perils, of treasure islands and pirates' booty, of Western cowboys and metropolitan detectives, of "moving accidents by flood and field", of foreign travel and life in the open and thrilling risks and courted dangers and the whole long catalogue of the fiction-writer's devices. Now, there is nothing surer than that the career of many an American youth is practically determined by just such literature, or rather by the spirit of romance to which it caters. Of the thousands of young men under thirty who flocked to the colors at the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, or more recently to the Mexican border, how many were actuated by patriotism pure and simple, and how many by the love of adventure so characteristic of normal boyhood and youth!

Is there any impossibility, or even any inherent difficulty involved, in supernaturalizing this adventurous spirit in our Catholic young people? Suppose that at home and in school they are copiously supplied with the true stories of the heroes of our Faith, with the intensely interesting narratives of real

adventures experienced by our foreign missionaries, with the thrilling accounts of dangers confronted and death defied by the martyrs, not of the historical primitive Church, but of our own day—will not the baleful influence of hedonism, or belief in the supreme importance of securing a "good time" be effectively counteracted, and God's grace find a congenial soil in which to sow the seeds of an apostolic vocation? We have to-day "Lives of the Saints" that make thoroughly good, not merely goody-goody, reading for young folks—numbers of them may be found in the catalogue of the London Catholic Truth Society, and an increasing stock of biographies of near-saints as charming as they are edifying. We have, too, not only such specific Foreign Missions periodicals as *The Illustrated Catholic Missions* and *The Field Afar*, but a Missions department of a column or two in most of our Catholic weeklies. And, in the matter of wonderful happenings and exciting events and terrifying incidents and miraculous escapes, these "really truly" stories told by our missionaries immeasurably surpass the imaginative narratives of the fictionists. Now, it can hardly be doubted that concerted action on the part of priests and parents and teachers would create in the minds of our boys and girls genuine interest in such veritably Catholic literature, an interest which, just as "the appetite increases with eating", would grow with their growth and beneficently affect their whole future careers, even if it did not, as in many a case it presumably would, enkindle a noble desire for a life of sacrifice on the foreign mission.

It goes without saying, of course, that the foregoing paragraph will impress not a few readers as a piece of optimistic idealism, and the writer is quite prepared indeed to hear it characterized by an ultra-practical cleric in some such terms as "pure poppycock and pietistic piffle". He maintains nevertheless that such a formation of the rising generation of Catholics is neither impracticable nor particularly difficult. One reason for this conviction is a consideration to which the average priest has perhaps not given all the attention or attributed all the importance which it very certainly merits: the effect of frequent and daily Communion on the children and adolescents of our day. Whether or not Pius X foresaw the European War and its disastrous effects on the For-

eign Missions, his action in confirming the decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus*, and in subsequently lowering the age at which children may be admitted to the Holy Table, assuredly facilitated the securing of American recruits to the ranks of the Church's apostolic laborers in lands beyond the ocean. To doubt that a deeper spirituality and a more ardent love of self-sacrifice will characterize a youthful generation that has from childhood partaken daily of the Bread of Life would be constructively to question the beneficent action of the Eucharist on the development of the interior life or what we commonly call growth in holiness. Given such spirituality, is it extravagant to assert that many a youth will be irresistibly drawn to a career which, just because of its acknowledged hardships and privations, appeals all the more strongly to his spirit of sacrifice? Let the clerical reader of this page hark back to his own boyhood, recall his own spirit (fostered by Communion only once a week or once a fortnight), and give his own answer to the question.

There is yet another consideration which should not be lost sight of in any discussion of this subject: efforts to discover and foster vocations to the Foreign Missions will almost inevitably increase the number of vocations to the priesthood for the home field; and that such vocations are needed is clear from the statements of numerous prelates, especially in the Western States. The congruous episcopal attitude toward the question is well expressed in the assurance given by Archbishop Mundelein to the Fathers of the Divine Word, at St. Mary's Mission, Techny: "How glad I am that your school and novitiate are established in my diocese. True, I am in urgent need of men to carry on the work at home, but I will never put an obstacle in the way of your obtaining vocations in this diocese, because I know that the young missionaries who will go forth from your institution to devote themselves to the salvation of the poor heathen in faraway countries will call down Heaven's especial blessing on our work at home." What His Grace of Chicago says of his diocese may be said with fully as much propriety of any parish whose pastor interests himself and his people in the Foreign Missions: God's blessing will descend upon it, superabundantly rewarding even in this life both pastor and flock.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

Notre Dame, Indiana.

OLD CHURCHYARDS: THEIR SECULAR SIDE.

THE CHURCHYARD CROSS.

IN the former paper[1] on Old English Churchyards allusion was made to the cross. Doubtless every Old English churchyard had a cross. It stood in a conspicuous position, and was in many cases an ornate piece of sculpture. Not a few of these crosses are, in a more or less perfect condition, still extant.

Previous to, as well as after, the Christian era, the cross was in some sense a religious symbol, even among the ancient pagans. One form of it appears on Egyptian monuments, and was employed as an emblem of immortality. The Spaniards are said to have found upon their conquest of South America a form of the cross which was regarded as an object of veneration by the pagan inhabitants of that continent. Authorities have maintained that the northern nations of Europe venerated the cross in prehistoric times, because in it they beheld the hammer of Thor, their mighty god of war, who was inferior only to Odin in power and strength.

The churchyard crosses of the Anglo-Saxon period generally had the figure of our Saviour carved on them; and they were usually erected either near the south door of the church, or by the side of the pathway leading to it. This site was chosen so that the faithful might be reminded to pray for the souls of the departed whose mortal remains were moldering beneath the grass near their feet.

Another name for this cross was the "palm cross"; because on Palm Sunday it formed one of the stations in the procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Moreover, after the Passion had been recited at Mass on that day, the blessed palms were brought out and the cross was decked with them.

Not only were acts of religious ceremonial performed at the churchyard cross, but many civil functions also took place there. Mayors were elected, folkmotes held, papal bulls read, royal proclamations made known, and heretical books burnt, at the cross. At the Reformation, and for centuries before, St. Paul's Cross was a noted feature of St. Paul's Cathedral,

[1] See ECCL. REVIEW, November, 1915, pp. 508-520.

London. It was as well known then as is the Nelson Column to the present generation.

Symbolism of the Cross.

There is an interesting and close connexion between the *tau* of Egypt, the cross, as both a heathen and Christian symbol, and the hammer of the Scandinavian god Thor. With the Egyptians the sacred sign of the tau was the symbol of life. The early Christians of Egypt adopted it in lieu of the cross, which was afterward substituted for it. They prefixed it to inscriptions in like manner as the cross was in later times, and numerous inscriptions headed by the tau are still preserved in the early Christian sepulchres at the Great Oasis. The scarab (beetle) was held sacred by the Egyptians because the sutures down the back, and across the thorax, form a T.

In India, certain Hindu ascetics, who sit for days and nights together in a Buddha-like attitude on the ground, used a crutched cross in the form of a tau on which to rest their arms. And, according to Moor, author of the *Hindu Pantheon* and *Oriental Fragments*, the Greek tau, or T, is supposed to have been the sign which, in later days, distinguished the names of the living after a battle, etc. from the dead. The names of the latter were marked with a θ indicating "dead". Thus the tau was then held to be the symbol of life.

The presence of the cross, the svastika (the Chinese form of the tau), and other symbols, on a Mohammedan building —and of an animal's head and a cross on Mohammedan graves —is most remarkable, since this faith does not as a rule allow of symbolism of any kind, still less of the effigy of any living thing.

The use of the tau as an emblem is very widespread. The badge worn by the medicine men of the Queen Charlotte Isles bore a cross. Sometimes the medicine men used to impress a tau on their foreheads. The cross was used by the islanders, as a symbol, on large sheets of copper, to which they attached a high value, and each of which they called a "tau". And the ancients used to mark the captives who were to be saved also with a tau.

Figures of the tau are, says Jomard, numerous in the buildings, bas-reliefs, and even in the form of lights, of the ancient

city of Palenque in Central America. Captain Bourke, U.S.A., in his work on the Moquis of Arizona, says: "Preparatory to taking part in the snake dance, old and young of both sexes put on curious head-dresses of boards, painted green or sky-blue, with tips of red or yellow, in which were incisions in the shape of a crescent, the cross, or the letter T." And a tau, with a human head in place of the ansa or handle, was found depicted on the wall of a house in the ruined city of Pompeii, in juxtaposition with the Phallus or Lingam.

Prestor John, the Christian Emperor in Africa, circa A. D. 370, formed certain monks, who had led austere lives in the desert, into a religious order of knighthood. This was the Order of St. Antony of Ethiopia, one of the earliest orders of foreign knighthood. Its members wore a black habit, and for their ensign used a blue cross, edged with gold, in the form of the letter T.

The cross was also widely known as a pre-Christian symbol. For the svastika (a form of the cross) had existed in Asia before European history began. The Spaniards, when they first visited South America, found the cross in some of the heathen temples there. And in Mexico they were much struck with the stone crosses which they found on the coast and in the interior of that country, and which were considered objects of veneration and worship. To the Mexicans the cross was a symbol of rain, and of the fertilizing element—or rather of the four winds, the bearers of rain. It would appear that the cross had also another signification for them, since near the spot where the city of Vera Cruz was afterward built, there was a marble cross which was surmounted by a golden crown. In reply to the inquiries of the Spanish ecclesiastics, the natives said: "One more glorious than the sun had died upon the cross"! The cross was regarded as a rain symbol by the Mexicans, and their name for it—*tomaquahuitl*, or tree of life —combines the twofold idea of fertility conferred by the possession of the tau or cross, and salvation through the cross or tree of life.

It is now known that the cross was in familiar use among the prehistoric peoples of North America, as well as among some of its present Indian tribes, with whom it was a symbol of both the sun and the weather. The so-called mound-

builders of Missouri were also familiar with the cross. In a narrow valley near the town of Tarlton, in Ohio, there is a remarkable earth-work in the form of a Greek cross +. It is raised about three feet above the adjacent surface, and round it is a shallow ditch exactly corresponding to its outline. The Blackfoot Indians are in the habit of arranging boulders in the form of a cross. According to them, stones thus arranged symbolize the "old man in the sun, who rules the winds": they mark his resting-places, and the limbs of the cross represent his body and arms. Among the Delaware Indians the rain-makers draw upon the ground a figure of the cross, and cry aloud to the spirit of the rains. How and whence the cross reached prehistoric America will probably remain a mystery. From its presence on the objects found within the mounds of St. Louis, the presumption is that this symbol was used by prehistoric races of whom we have absolutely no knowledge, except from their primitive monuments and relics.

Having rapidly reviewed the tau as a prehistoric and pagan symbol, let us now briefly consider the hammer of Thor. In studying Scandinavian symbolism, we must bear in mind that Scandinavia did not become Christian till the beginning of the eleventh century. The people of Norway and Sweden appear to have adopted early the Latin form of the cross; but we are brought into close contact also with sun, moon, and fire worship, since, for a time at least, they retained their sun symbolism in connexion with their new faith. This is shown by the discovery of small crucifixes with pendant sun symbols. Later on, small pendants in the form of the Latin cross were substituted for the sun emblems attached to the base and arms of the earlier examples. The tau of Egypt and the svastika, or Hindu and Buddhist form of the cross, are also met with in Scandinavia. The svastika was the emblem of Thor, the chief god of the Scandinavians; according to their mythology, he was the god of the air, of thunder and lightning, as well as of fire. He is said to have waged war with giants, and to have killed them with his hammer or mallet, his great weapon of destruction. This was another cross-like symbol, and to it was ascribed the marvellous property of always returning to its owner after having been launched upon its mission.

In the Historical Museum at Stockholm there are several examples, realistic as well as conventional forms, of the hammer of Thor. Many of these small ornaments seem, from their shape, to establish a link between the tau and the more usual forms of the cross. One such is a perfect Egyptian tau, wanting only the ansa at the upper end. All are, for the most part, made of silver; and some are wrought with elaborate designs in filigree. In some cases the chain by which they were suspended was found with them. One such chain is especially interesting, as its make is precisely the same as the Trichinopoly chains of southern India.

Since Thor was the god of fire, as is evident from his svastika emblem, he was naturally held to be the god of the domestic hearth also. His hammer was also looked upon as an instrument of possession. Hence, when a bride entered her new home, one of Thor's hammers was thrown into her lap. Even now, Thor's-day (Thursday) is deemed in Scandinavia the auspicious day for nuptials; and a man, when purchasing a piece of land, takes possession of it by throwing a hammer upon it. The same idea exists in Indian mythology. Vishnu, in one of his avatars or successive incarnations, is fabled to have gained possession of a considerable extent of land, in the kingdom of Travancore, by throwing his battle-axe upon it.

With us, too, the notion of possession or authority is attached to and associated with the hammer, thus connecting our own times with the mythology and beliefs of ancient, barbarous, and pagan peoples. The mallet or hammer has its use in Masonic degree work as a symbol of authority; and the auctioneer, with a tap of his hammer, confers possession on the highest bidder.

Churchyards used as Bell-Foundries.

Altar candles and processional tapers were not the only articles that were manufactured within the confines of hallowed ground. Bells, too, were frequently cast in churchyards. In the days of the early bell-foundries, the country roads were little better than miry lanes, full of ruts and holes; especially when the moisture of winter was not evaporated, as was sometimes the case, even during the summer. For this

reason bells were mostly cast in the immediate vicinity of the monasteries or churches which they were intended to grace. When, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, the great-bell (called the "Amphibalus") at St. Alban's Abbey was broken, it was recast in the hall of the sacristy. The bells of Meaux Abbey were cast within the precincts. And, at Kirby, Malzeard, Haddenham, and other places, the bells were cast within the church itself. But, more frequently, the churchyard was chosen for the purpose. The "Great Tom" of Lincoln (in 1610), and the "Great Harry" of Canterbury (in 1762), were cast in the yards of their respective cathedrals. By this means the bell-founders obviated the risks of transit.

Churchyards as Courts of Justice.

The churchyard was often used as a court of justice, where pleas were heard and settled. What better place than this could, in early days, be found for hearing disputes and settling cases! Here it was that the bishop sat with the sheriff, that the clerics were the lawyers, that oaths were taken on everything that was holy, and round which a man's whole sacred associations clustered. In later times the ecclesiastical authorities discouraged the holding of secular pleas in churches and churchyards. A synod held at Exeter, in 1287, decreed: "Let not secular pleas be held in churchyards"; but as late as 1472 a presentment from the parish of Helmsley and Stamforthbrig shows "that all the parishioners there hold pleas and other temporal meetings in the church and churchyard".

Doles Distributed in Churchyards.

Doles were frequently distributed in churchyards. In a few places this custom still survives. Every Good Friday the Vicar of St. Bartholomew the Great, in Smithfield, London, drops twenty-one sixpences in a row on a certain lady's grave. The money is picked up by the same number of widows, kneeling, who have previously attended the service at the church.

Leonard Dare, in 1611, directed that on Christmas Day, Lady Day, and Michaelmas Day, the churchwardens were "to buy, bring and lay on his tombstone, three-score penny loaves of good wholesome bread", which were to be distributed to the poor of the parish.

Sometimes the doles were scrambled for in the churchyard. This was the case at St. Mary's, Paddington, London. The custom continued well into the beginning of the nineteenth century. It originated with two poor sisters who walked to London to claim an estate, and arrived at Paddington in a weary, hungry, and foot-sore condition. The good folk of the place were roused to sympathy by the miserable plight of the two women and gave them relief. The sisters succeeded in establishing their claim; and, as a token of gratitude to the people of Paddington, they left a bequest of bread and cheese to the parishioners; but the dole was to be thrown from the top of the church, and scrambled for by the assembled people in the churchyard below. The bread and cheese was thrown from the belfry at eight A. M. on the Sunday preceding Christmas Day.

At Barford, Oxford, a piece of land is called "White Bread Close", because formerly the rent of this ground was spent in buying bread to be scrambled for at the church door.

Another curious custom connected with the distribution of doles in churchyards is still observed at the village of Wolton in Buckinghamshire, where it has been regularly maintained for the past two hundred years. William Glanville, a resident of the parish, died in 1717. In his will he left provision for forty shillings to be paid to each poor boy of the parish. There were, however, certain conditions attached to this bequest. On the anniversary of his funeral the boys were to attend at the churchyard and, with their hands upon his tombstone, repeat the Pater noster, Credo, and Decalogue; also, read aloud the Fifteenth Chapter of the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and write, in a legible hand, two verses from the same.

Charms and Cures.

The churchyard has been credited with sundry charms and cures. The fact that misfortunes and sickness of every kind have been attributed to evil agency, or to the presence of some malign spirit that needed to be expelled from the sufferer's person, may account, to some extent at least, for the solicitation of help within the sacred precincts of a church. Whether this be so or no, it is certain that such spiritual help has been, and in some cases still is, earnestly sought again and again.

Epilepsy, which for many years was associated with demoniacal possession, has been a favorite ailment for this kind of nostrum. One of the charms prescribed for its cure directs the sufferer to walk thrice round the church at midnight, then to enter the building and stand before the altar. In some parts of the West of England the following superstition is regarded as a sure cure for epilepsy: the epileptic is to wear a ring, which has been made from three nails (or screws) which have been used to fasten a coffin, and which must have been dug out of a churchyard.

Goitre may be cured, according to the natives of Launceston in Cornwall, and the surrounding district, by visiting, before sunrise on May-day, the grave of the last young person of the opposite sex who has been buried in the churchyard, and applying the dew, gathered by passing the hand thrice from the head to the foot of the grave, to the part affected by the ailment.

For the removal of warts there are numerous superstitious remedies connected with the churchyard. For instance, it is believed that a certain cure will be effected if each wart is touched by a new pin, every pin enclosed in the same bottle, and the bottle then buried in the newly-made grave of a person belonging to the opposite sex to the sufferer. As the pins rust, the warts will disappear.

Jaundice was supposed to yield to a churchyard charm, as the following incident illustrates. A gentleman visiting a village churchyard near St. Anstell in Cornwall, noticed a woman approach an open grave. She stood beside it, and seemed for the moment to be muttering something. When the muttering ceased, she produced from beneath her cloak a large-sized meal cake, which she threw into the grave, and then left the spot. Upon inquiry, the observer ascertained that the cake was composed of oatmeal mixed with some objectionable matter, baked, and then thrown into the open grave as a charm for the yellow jaundice. On further inquiry the questioner was informed that such a remedy was commonly believed in by the peasantry of that district.

Death omens have also been associated with the churchyard. It was the common belief, far and wide, that those who watched in the church-porch at midnight on the eve of SS. Mark and John, All Hallows', and All Souls', would most

certainly see the forms of those parishioners who were destined to die within the next twelve months. The young people especially were given to observing this superstition. It was held that the spectres of those appointed to die within the coming year would pass through the churchyard and porch and enter the church. This belief in what was called the "death-ride" was so readily and fully held that, if those who were ill chanced to hear that it was thought their form had been seen, they would often at once begin to relinquish any hope of recovery, and in some cases even died through the influence of their foolish fears.

"'Tis now," replied the village belle,
"St. Mark's mysterious Eve;
And all that old traditions tell
I tremblingly believe.

"How, when the midnight signal tolls,
Along the churchyard green
A mournful train of sentenced souls
In winding-sheets are seen!

"The ghosts of all whom Death shall doom
Within the coming year,
In pale procession walk the gloom
Amid the silence drear."

Considering that the veneration for churchyards, as is evident from the privilege of the right of sanctuary and the beliefs as to charms and cures, was so general and strong, it is strange that complaints were made, and rules laid down, about the behavior in churchyards. Yet such was the fact. The Canons of King Edgar (A. D. 959—975) were framed under the strong reforming influence of St. Dunstan. They were intended as a standard of life and duty for the clergy. Among a number of injunctions, instructions were laid down for the keeping of the church and its precincts, with all due reverence. The following are extracts: "That every man learn the Pater noster and Credo if he desire to lie in holy ground [at his burial] and be considered 'housel-worthy'" [i. e. fit to receive Holy Communion]. "Nor allow dogs in the churchyard, nor more swine than a man is able to manage [or, no dog nor swine, so far as a man can prevent it]; that nothing unbecoming be placed in the church; that at the 'church-wake' men keep sober," etc.

After Mass on Sunday it was not very uncommon for a pedlar to seize the opportunity, of the people congregating at church, to display his wares in the churchyard in spite of injunctions to the contrary. In the presentation of the churchwardens of Ricall in Yorkshire, 1519, they complain that "Pedlars come into the church porch on feast-days, and there sell their goods". Earlier, in 1416, the wardens and questmen of St. Michael-le-Belfry, York, stated that "a common market of vendibles is held in the churchyard on Sundays and holy-days; and divers things, and goods, and rushes, are exposed for sale".

The *Instructions for Parish Priests*, written by John Myrk (Canon of Lilleshall, in Shropshire, and not the author of *Liber Festivalis*), the oldest manuscript of which belongs to the first half of the fifteenth century, contains these instructions: "Within the church and seyntuary [the churchyard was frequently called the "sanctuary"] people are not to sing or cry; nor to cast the 'axtre' or stone, or play 'Bull and Bears' in the churchyard". The author also gives metrical paraphrases of the Pater noster, Ave and Creed, with a brief explanation of the last; together with a quaint, yet striking, illustration of the doctrine of the Trinity:

> Water and ice, and eke snowe—
> Here be three things as ye may see,
> And yet the three all water be.

Church Wakes and Church Fairs.

Church wakes and church fairs may here be treated, if not actually regarded, as one and the same thing, so difficult is it at times to differentiate them. The name wake comes from the Old English word *waec*, and is equivalent to a "vigil". Wakes were originally a religious festival held in honor of the patron saint of the village. The word fair is derived from the Latin *feria*, meaning a holiday, i. e. festival or holyday. The fairs also took place on the feast of the patron saint of the local church. Both wakes and fairs therefore had an ecclesiastical origin, and were, at their inception, religious festivals. The religious purpose soon developed a distinctly secular side, however, and the sacred element of the old wakes and fairs passed away.

During their earlier and purer period, it was the custom for the inhabitants of the place to keep open house, and entertain their relations and friends, who came from a distance to visit them at the festive season of the annual wake or fair. Hence the church wake was both a religious festival and a great social and friendly gathering, promoting kindly and neighborly feelings, and encouraging an annual visit from both relations and friends from afar. The Sunday on which the festival occurred was called Wake Sunday. By degrees, however, the festival-keepers ceased to remember and regard the religious origin and purpose of the wake, and began to emphasize the secular side by excessive feasting and bartering. Country folk flocked thither from far and near; pedlars and hawkers found a ready market for their wares, the vendors and stalls rapidly multiplying; and thus the germ of a religious festival became a vast concourse of traders, and a veritable "Vanity Fair".

Not only was the churchyard used as the fair grounds, but often into the church-porch, and sometimes even into the church itself, the throng of traders surged, displaying their merchandise. In this primitive stage of fairs or wakes the traders paid no toll or rent for their stalls. Gradually, the right of granting permission to hold a fair was vested in the king, who, for various considerations, bestowed this power on bishops, nobles, monasteries, and merchant gilds.

Great profits accrued from these wakes and fairs, especially in the case of villages where the church was dedicated to some more than usually popular saint of the people. The itinerant vendors of wares both great and small found that the large concourse at such gatherings gave them an excellent opportunity for profitable trading; and those who could cater for the amusement of the crowd were not less quick in seizing the occasion.

Later, definite taxes and regulations were enforced. Each trader had to pay (1) a toll on all goods brought to the fair; (2) stallage or rent for his "pitch", as was called the stall or ground on which his merchandise was displayed; (3) commission on all the goods sold. Moreover, the local tradesfolk, the village shopkeepers, etc., were compelled to close their shops during the period of the fair, and obliged to bring their wares to the fair grounds.

Though the religious services connected with the wake were neither forgotten nor omitted, the business and festive features became so prominent as largely to obscure its sacred aspect, and frequently called for measures of restraint. As early as King Edgar's reign (A. D. 959—975) a canon was enacted warning the people not to spend, in drunkenness and debauchery, the wake season, which was specially designed for prayer and devotion. Three centuries later, the Papal Legate, Cardinal Othobon, issued certain constitutions (at the Synod of London, 1268), one of which forbade the placing of stalls, for the purpose of merchandise, within the walls of the church. From this we may judge to what extent the business side of the wake had intruded upon the devotional, having gone so far as even to enter the church itself. Edward I (A. D. 1272—1307) brought in a statute which went further, forbidding fairs and markets being held in churchyards. And in 1448 Henry VI forbade the holding of fairs or the display of merchandise on the great festivals of the Christian year. By these means some of the more unseemly customs, which at one time accompanied wakes, were gradually stopped; and the sacred enclosure of the churchyard, and still more of the church itself, were to a great extent protected from desecration by profane uses.

So late as 1571, Archbishop Grindal of York issued injunctions to the laity of the Northern Province ordering "that the minister and church-wardens shall not suffer any 'Lords of Misrule', or 'Summer Lords (or Ladies)', or any disguised persons, or others, in Christmas or at 'May Games'— or any minstrels, morrice dancers, or others, at 'rush bearings', or at any other time, to come irreverently into any church, or chapel, or churchyard, and there dance, or play any unseemly parts with scoffs, jests, wanton gestures, or ribald talk, namely in the time of divine service, or of any sermon". The conclusion of the paragraph is curiously worded, since it is obviously not intended that these things were allowable in church or churchyard at other times. The rush-bearing mentioned in this injunction is practically the same as the wake—the gathering and bringing of rushes wherewith to strew the floor of the church being one of the details preliminary to the celebration of the annual wake or parish feast.

In time, however, as "Merrie England" became with each succeeding generation more and more "Busy England", the multiplicity of these holidays was felt to be somewhat of a grievance, and an attempt was made to meet the case by ordering that all dedication festivals throughout the country should be celebrated on the same day, the first Sunday in October. This was enacted by convocation in 1536, with the result that the wakes were not transferred, but that many of them dropped out of observance.

The custom of using the churchyard for purposes both of business and pleasure was very common and persistent. As early as the fourth century St. Basil protested against the holding of markets within the precincts of churches, under pretext of making better provision for the people attending the festivals from a distance; but the custom held its own, and we have a catena of synodical declarations against holding secular courts, fairs, and markets, and indulging in sports in churchyards; and a series of complaints by synodsmen, in their annual presentation to the bishops, of the breach of the canons. For, the church that contained some saint's shrine or "relic" attracted crowds from all parts for the period of the anniversary, and the more popular the shrine, correspondingly greater was the fair attached to it. Celebrated as was the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury, that of Our Lady of Walsingham almost surpassed it, so much so that the popular belief was that the Milky Way pointed toward Walsingham, and was therefore called the "Walsingham Way"; while Glastonbury, on account of the number and sacredness of its relics, was called the "Second Rome". When the pilgrims to these shrines had paid their devotion to the relics, they needed refreshments, and were not averse to spending the remainder of the day in amusements; accordingly players, minstrels, jugglers, and the like, supplied the demand, so that in time the pilgrimage became also a fair. Indeed, one reason why the porch of many of the Old English parish churches is so large originated in providing rest and shelter for worshippers coming from a distance. And, as even quarrelling and fighting sometimes attended the monastic fairs, it was not uncommon, when a fair was about to be held in the precincts of the cathedral or monastery, to oblige every man to take an oath at the gate, before

being admitted, that he would neither lie, steal, nor cheat, during his visit to the fair.

Although it is evident that the British of a former generation did not scruple to convert the churchyards into public recreation grounds on Sundays and holidays, we should not pass judgment too hastily on them. It behooves us to be slow and just in our verdict. We should remember that those were days when it was not safe to remain long unprotected in open spaces, on account of wild beasts and robbers; and the churchyard offered protection. Moreover, there were no Eight Hours Bill or Early Closing Associations then. It was nothing but work from dawn to dusk; and the only cessation from toil, or opportunity for recreation was on Sundays and holidays.

J. R. FRYAR.

Canterbury, England.

THE PRIESTLY TEMPERAMENT.

GRACE seems to surrender frequently to nature, although the intrinsic superiority of the former is beyond all question. Temperament and inadvertence offer obstacles to the action of divine grace and delay the spiritual transformation for which we look in the supernatural man. We are, of course, under the providence of God, masters of our fate. He gives His graces in abundance, but our choices condition their effect. And our choices are very often modified by temperament and inadvertence. Right attitudes of mind assist us in accepting grace. Mistaken attitudes of mind interfere with grace's action and hamper the process of the soul's growth. Faults of method in the spiritual life produce their own harvest of failure. Grace seems to take for its own the law that the Scholastics gave us for the operation of the mind. "Quidquid recipitur per modum recipientis recipitur."

Whatever be doctrine or fact in the relations of nature and grace, the priest ought to show forth in his life the supremacy of grace. He should be a transformed man. If religion is internal and transforming, as it must be, the priest should be made over, transformed. The strength in temperament that leads him toward fault should be subdued by the certain re-

straints of grace. The weakness in temperament which exposes him to fault and sin should be so overcome by grace as to bring his average of spiritual strength up to priestly ideals. Unless these results are accomplished by the action of grace in the priest's life, he will yield more to nature than can be pardoned and receive less from grace than may be asked. A priest who is sensitive, suspicious, or intolerant by nature should conquer these qualities by the aid of divine grace. When the suspicious temperament is corrected by frankness and benevolence, when patience displaces resentment, when intolerance yields to charity and breadth of mind, we find proof of the action of grace in transforming temperament. When the morbid self-centered man is made bright and sympathetic, we find again proof of the presence and action of grace. The priest must show forth in his life the transforming power of the spirit of God. The laity show him reverence and obedience because they expect this of him.

To some extent judgment of the action of grace in the transformation of character will depend more on faith than on demonstration. We must believe that everything counts in the presence of God. We know through faith, that every kindly act and reverent prayer and habit of self-discipline finds its measured equivalent in the spiritual refinement of life. We may not know just where this strength is stored in the unexplored recesses of the heart. We may not know the units of its measurement, nor the secret of its control. We may, in fact, not find conspicuous signs of sanctity in a transformed life. Yet we have the certainty of faith for the appreciation placed on every prayer and communion, every act of self-denial, every aspiration and thought found in the Christian life. We work and pray and accumulate merit which is known to God alone. Our familiar faults cling to us. Our shortcomings continue to annoy us. Yet beneath them there is a tidal movement showing the flow of deep, rich life toward God. Faith always, evidence very often gives us this assurance. Perhaps nothing stands forth more clearly in the traditions of spiritual literature than this. The sense of accomplishment is rarely given to those who live perfect lives in the presence of God. St. Paul found so much still to be done that he dwelt not at all on what he had achieved. While we

naturally crave the encouragement that comes from the thought of successful effort, that joy is frequently withheld from us in the spiritual life. It makes more real the appeal of the everlasting day which God assures to those who love him.

When we take into account the temperament that leads one to the priesthood, the process of careful formation through which the soul is carried, the experience of the ministry and the thoughtful control of feeling and aim which is called for in priestly life, we see clearly that there must be a priestly temperament which one may understand and describe. Temperament in a priest aids or hinders his personal sanctification and affects his ministry profoundly. Setting aside the question as a whole, we may take up certain traits found in the priestly temperament which merit thought and suggest self-examination.

The Habit of Edification.

The habit of edification is fundamental in the priestly character. The priest must cultivate the talent of seeing and rejoicing in goodness wherever it is found. One may be indifferent to moral beauty or to a rare type of spiritual heroism just as one may be indifferent to the glory of a sunset or the grandeur of a mountain. The habit of edification, of discovering and enjoying goodness in the lives of others, can be cultivated as readily as the talent to appreciate beauty in nature or art, and to enjoy symmetry in line or proportion in mass or unity in composition. On the other hand one may remain untouched by moral and spiritual excellence just as one may be ignorant and unresponsive before a masterpiece of imagination and execution in the domain of art.

If God is in everything, the priest ought to be able to find Him and point Him out. Where supernatural goodness is, there is grace. If the spirit of God shines forth dimly in natural and fully in supernatural virtue, the priest should be expert in detecting that presence and forcible in proclaiming it. He should be expert in producing goodness in his own life. His life should show forth that balance among the virtues, that proportion in judgment, pursuit and expression, which may be called the most attractive fruit of grace in human life. The priest should be skilled in discovering good-

ness in others. Whatever the reticences and disguises of virtue—for real virtue is timid—it should never escape the vigilant priestly eye. Everything wholesome, pure, and self-forgetting in the world should teach him, rouse him, and make him happy. He should feel a quick impulse to understand and enjoy it, as tact and circumstance permit, much as the discovery of a noble paragraph or of a picture of rare beauty sends one in search of others to share the joy of it. This is more than a figure of speech. Either it is literally true or nothing that we say about the exalted office of the priesthood is true. There is much wisdom in Dolly Winthrop's principle in *Silas Marner*: "If there's any good to be got, we've need of it i' this world—that we have."

A priest who can witness an act of moral heroism or deal with a refined character without feeling his heart touched and inspired, is a spiritual defective. He lacks a primary talent of the supernatural life. A priest who can read with indifference a noble page that might open new spiritual vistas to his soul and might show forth in clearer light his own exalted mission and destiny, is dull and inert where the work of God calls upon him to be intense and sure. Every noble thought or pure emotion or refined example brought to our knowledge by observation or reading, is a messenger of God. Our spiritual writers have not hesitated to call it a grace. If our minds are not open to such appeal, we are spiritual dwarfs. If we shut our minds against influence of this kind, we defeat the benevolence of God. If we are merely indifferent and unmoved, we waste the treasures of heaven.

This habit of edification must be cultivated. It depends partly on talent, largely on will and therefore on grace. It is conditioned by our ordinary mental processes. On its natural side at least it is a point of view, a method of singling out certain features of human conduct and admiring them. There are many battles to be fought in the process of developing this power. One cannot escape many struggles with temperament, many severe processes of self-denial in the course of it. This habit of edification constitutes the fundamental charm of the saints. In the atmosphere of a soul that has developed it, resentment, sarcasm, selfishness can find no place. The habit of seeing and loving goodness is the birth-right of every

priest. God gives it for the asking. But it must be asked as God ordains. Once it is given, it fills the world with goodness and inspiration. It brings to the heart all happiness and peace.

There are many features of the habit of edification that should appeal to us. There is the supreme joy of it; the joy of discovering something that we prize highly; the joy of being inspired by the spirit of God in our spiritual ways. This ought to be the dearest experience in the world to the heart of a priest. An expert in goodness should be delighted in the discovery of it anywhere. Then there is the strength of it, the bend of life toward the goodness that we admire. To meet and appreciate moral heroism or spiritual grandeur of any kind clears our spiritual understanding. It sharpens the instinct by which we recognize our own temptations and the subtle disguise of their approach. It stimulates sluggish impulses, awakens us from indifference to zeal. It gives us example that we may imitate, nobility that we may praise, inspiration that we may obey. Then there is the helpfulness of it, the help that we give to others by appreciating their goodness. These find virtue much more attractive when we recognize and encourage it. Few of us realize how much we may do in the moral upbuilding of others by respecting goodness in them and by declaring it with tact. It is the business of the priest to develop goodness and bring it forth in others. His own habit of edification develops this power in him wonderfully. James Lane Allen says in *A Cathedral Singer*: "It is the rarest experience of our lifetime that we meet a man or a woman who literally drives us to the realization of what we really are and can really do when we do our best. What we all most need in our careers is the one who can liberate within us that life-long prisoner whose doom it is to remain a captive until another sets it free—our best. For we can never set our best free by our own hands; that must always be done by another."

Finally, there is the democracy of it. The habit of edification distinguishes neither high nor low, learned nor ignorant, weak nor powerful. Who more than Dickens has shown this? He tells us that one of the great lessons that he sought to teach his nation was that the noblest virtues in the world are found

among those in lowly station. Ruskin too caught the point. He says: "I trust there are few men so unhappy as never to have learned anything from their inferiors; and I fear there are few men so wise as never to have initiated anything but what was deserving of imitation."

A priest who lacks the habit of edification—that is, capacity to be helped by the good example of others and sensitiveness to spiritual beauty wherever found—is seriously handicapped in the process of his own sanctification, because he is deprived of one of the chief supports of spiritual ideals. Furthermore, he loses one evidence of the spiritual mastership which his priesthood calls upon him to exercise over the souls entrusted to his care.

The Habit of Interpretation.

Some years ago a magazine published the life story of an immigrant from Central Europe who had a wonderful career in the United States. This remarkable sentence appeared in the story, "All things taught him".

All things should teach a priest. All things wait upon interpretation. The priest should be docile toward events. They teach us only when they are interpreted. A priest may cultivate the habit of interpretation or he may destroy it. He may learn from everything or he may learn from nothing. He may be impressed only by what is striking and wonderful while the commonplace leaves him untouched. The priest's mind should be docile toward the universe and sensitive to interpretations which put souls into things and arouse the mind. Are there not sermons in stones, tongues in trees, books in running brooks, good in everything? A mind which does not interpret is a dead mind. One which can interpret and will not is a lazy mind. The mind that is intelligent and trained is enabled to see the hidden meaning in things and to find joy and wisdom and peace in this vision. A spiritually-minded layman once said in substance to a friend, "Life is my literature. God is so evident at every turn, the dispositions of His Providence are so manifest and the moral processes of individual and social life are so clearly under the direction of His hand that I feel it possible to put my hand out in the dark and touch Him whenever I wish."

We who believe in God, believe that His Providence directs the ways of the world. We believe that there are no details in the plans of God. Everything proclaims His power, announces His law, and vindicates His wisdom.

O Thou whose equal purpose runs
In drops of rain or streams of suns,
And with a soft compulsion rolls
The green earth on her snowy poles;
O Thou who keepest in Thy ken
The time of flowers, the dooms of men,
Stretch out a mighty wing above,
Be tender to the land we love. (STAFFORD.)

We find the same thought nobly expressed by Ruskin, who tells us that, "The work of the great spirit of nature is as deep and unapproachable in the lowest as in the noblest objects; that the divine mind is as visible in its full energy of operation on every lowly bank and moldering stone as in the lifting of the pillars of heaven and settling the foundations of the earth; and that to the rightly perceiving mind there is the same infinity, the same majesty, the same power, the same unity, and the same perfection manifest in the casting of the clay as in the scattering of the cloud, in the moldering of the dust as in the kindling of the day-star."

God is in the course of human life no less than in nature. His overruling Providence exerts its sway over the imaginings of an innocent child no less than in the perplexities of a statesman. St. Paul has given us the supreme law of interpretation of the providence of God. "For them that love God, all things work together unto good." Now the priest is God's interpreter, a reverent, not arbitrary, interpreter, a docile, not self-sufficient representative of the divine law. He is called upon, then, through prayer and study to seek to find the ministry of God's way in the world and to interpret that way to souls. He must interpret history no less than contemporary life. He must interpret, in the collective life of society no less than in the career of the individual, the typical human experiences that he observes. The courses of life, the clash of forces, the sway of passion, the triumph of evil, the defeat of virtue, the association of innocence and suffering as they pass before his eyes every day, wait to be interpreted in the light of God's Providence, in order that the children of God may find their

peace and sure direction. Illness, temptation, trial, success, failure, distinction, even disgrace, innocence grieving and sin triumphant, leave traces of their coming and going in the very fibre of the soul. But only the gift of interpretation will enable the priest to find and to proclaim the purpose of God hidden within them. There is no other tradition more fixed in the history of Christianity than the conviction of the presence of an overruling Providence in each detail no less than in every mystery of life. Nothing is more evident than this, that only the spiritual eye can discern it and find wisdom in that discernment. What is more delightful than to meet a priest who possesses his gift of interpretation, who by instinct rather than culture, by intuition rather than intention traces with throbbing heart the wonderful course of divine Providence in his own life and in the lives of others entrusted to his care. "Holy men", says St. Gregory, "in that they are one with our Lord, are not ignorant of His sense."

It is said that experience teaches. Experience cannot teach unless it is interpreted. Much of the morality of the world is built on the interpretation of accumulated human experience in relation to moral and spiritual principles. The practical wisdom of any man is the result largely of his interpretation of experience. Business forms, forms and methods in credit, the progress of the professions are simply established interpretations of experience. The virtues are completed through interpretation. No outlook on life is true except the spiritual outlook. The spiritual outlook rests on God and the human soul and all human souls, and on the overruling providence of God in the direction of human affairs. Therefore, the fully developed man is spiritually minded. The worthy priest is spiritually minded. Many of us all but lose our souls by not taking the soul's point of view in the world and by not realizing that God deals with us as having souls and that we must accept our souls with all of their implications if we are to know God's ways at all.

There are certain fallacies of which one may be guilty in attempting to interpret either the course of history or of nature or of human life in the terms of the providence of God. One may assume, for instance, that it is easy to point out the providence of God. This is not true. To do so is

difficult because of our tendency to overlook the traits on which our surest guidance is conditioned — unselfishness, humility, sympathetic faith, reverence, detachment, and wide observation. It is not easy to interpret the providence of God in the present war [1] or in an earthquake or in a catastrophe that involves great suffering and leaves a trail of anguish and grief. We do know in a general way that the benevolent purposes of God maintain their sway as long as life endures. We do know that through the magic of the love of God all things may be made to serve us well. We may with due reserve and becoming reverence attempt to interpret the providence of God in its particular aspects. But the key to sure interpretation is found in our understanding of the providence of God as it governs our own life. The priest who fails to interpret his own life in the terms of the providence of God will have little success in his attempts to explain it in the lives of others. In a general way, we may point out the action of God in sending affliction of any kind. Pain has a wonderful ministry in the world. But when suffering is associated with innocence, and moral degradation brings no remorse, and evil lifts its head in triumphant scorn, the finding of the providence of God may not be as easy as it seems. We may speak of the blessings of poverty in the hope of encouraging the poor, but who shall give us insight into the kind of poverty that leads to shame and degradation and to the defilement of angelic innocence?

We must believe that every separate human life is under a special providence of God. Surely a human life means as much as a sparrow in the divine mind. The priest should be expert in finding that providence and in guiding the faithful according to its benevolent dispositions. God does not depend on platitudes in teaching us the laws of life. We may resort to platitudes in attempting to explain or interpret providence to others, but the gift of interpretation in our own lives or in the lives of others will not be given except when earned through prayer, reflection, and unselfish effort. Let

[1] "The religious results of the war are the secret of God, and none of us is in the Divine confidence."—Cardinal Mercier. A crude but touching effort to fathom the government of the world and the mystery of pain is found in Dolly Winthrop's discussion in *Silas Marner*, Book II, Chapter XVI.

us make no mistake. The providence of God is not easily discovered. But it may be discovered and declared as far as we have need of knowing it day by day.

There is another fallacy to which a priest is exposed in respect of the providence of God. It is that of interpreting Providence in a way to vindicate his own policies in governing a parish or dealing with the people. I have known it to occur. A priest who had a number of disagreements with members of his congregation interpreted every illness, accident, death, or misfortune which came to them, as acts of Providence punishing the parishioners for daring to resist him. Can there be a fairer proof of egotism and irreverence than this? When a priest foretells that the avenging providence of God will punish visibly a parishioner who refuses to contribute to a parish fund—and this has occurred—does not the irreverence amount to sin? One function of meditation in the priest's life is to sharpen the sense of interpretation of the providence of God and to guide in the discovery of the spiritual meaning of the experience of life. Our spiritual thinkers in all ages have endeavored with zeal and continued effort to discover the traces of God's action in the world and to teach us how to discover them for ourselves. One of the happiest compensations of meditation is found in the development of this spiritual attitude toward life in which the habit of interpretation becomes fundamental. It is, when well developed, the dearest source of spiritual assurance and holy wisdom.

One of the chief uses of great literature is to discover and portray the overruling providence of God in the world. The priest who is indifferent to literature loses this support of the spiritual life. When wisely read, literature develops spiritual imagination and sympathy and makes acute the moral sensibility which is the sentinel of all virtue. Literary critics tell us that literature explores human motive and passion through their inmost recesses. It discovers and charts the tidal movement of feeling, emotion, and aspiration that comes and goes in the human heart, and furnishes the key to the deeper interpretation of the events of human history.

All philosophers of history aim at the interpretation of life. We who believe in God and in the soul must develop

the habit of interpretation if we would have a spiritual outlook at all. The priest is the herald of God. Should he not be skilled in finding traces of the presence of God and in declaring the law of His action? As herald of God the priest has the pulpit and the confessional where he mediates between God and man, interpreting man to God and God to man. The vision and power that come to a priestly heart blessed with this power of interpretation abundantly repay all study, all prayer and effort. Surely the gift is worth the cost.

THE HABIT OF SELF-CONTROL.

The habit of edification gives soul to life. The habit of interpretation gives richness and depth to it. The habit of self-control gives moral safety and spiritual balance.

The normal man is conscious of the emotions of hatred, admiration, love, resentment, desire for mastery and distinction. In some mysterious way we accumulate an excess of emotion which is not expressed in normal occupations. It seeks expression in some secondary phase of our personality. Enthusiasms, mild aversions, fads, are like safety-valves which permit us to consume our surplus store of emotion and energy. The average man will hate something, love something, admire something, seek to dominate situations or persons and expect distinction or recognition. If this is true of men generally, it is, of course, true of the priest. No priest may be indifferent to the law of God, to the rule of spiritual perfection or to the approved standards of time and country or to the proprieties of his office in selecting objects or persons for dislike, admiration, mastery, distinction, or service. The deeper self is revealed through the persons and objects that we dislike and through the motives of our attitude; through those which we admire and proclaim and through the motives of our attitude; in the kinds of distinction that we seek, in the type of influence that we love to exercise, and in the forms of mastery for which we strive.

One becomes careless easily in respect of these. Were we to include in our examination of conscience our aversions and admirations, our longings for mastery and our pride in it, we would be greatly assisted in the work of self-knowledge and sanctification. Only such aversions, admirations, strivings as

can pass muster in the sight of God are permitted in the priestly heart. A spiritual assay undertaken to determine the purity of motive in our resentments, aspirations, and joys might cause us many an unpleasant surprise. We can sometimes cover our likes and dislikes in a way to hide their real meaning. But frank self-examination will often uncover a crude selfishness unworthy of our intelligence no less than of our priesthood.

Self-knowledge and self-control find their highest mission in these aspects of the priestly life. We live largely through our admirations, dislikes, indignations, love of mastery, and desire for distinction. The priest who has these emotions under fair control, holding true to the law of God and the spirit of His service, cannot fail to be of exalted type. The source of real self-control is found in a proper understanding of the value of things in the scheme of life. There are greater interests and lesser interests in the world. There are higher, no less than lower joys. There are experiences that are worth while and there are those that are not worth while. There are those that have a relative value as well as those which have an absolute value. It is really not a great achievement in the life of the priest to be expert in indicating the good points of a horse or to be a champion in some form of game. A priest who can play a skillful game of tennis or turn in a good score at golf, or is an expert shot or perfect horseman, possesses a source of real joy and wholesome companionship. No one with an " ounce of common sense " can say the contrary. But if pursuits of this kind steal the priest away from serious purposes, from the spiritual ambitions of his calling, and fill his diminished cup of happiness all too easily, his higher self-control will be overturned and he will find his joy in " insignificant supremacies ", which do him little honor and do his priesthood less. The priest must exercise intelligent spiritual control over admirations, dislikes, indignations, love of mastery and of relaxation, desire for distinction and lesser joys of life, if he would obey the plain law of God.

Self-control should extend always to the proportions observed in indulging feeling of whatsoever kind. A priest who becomes violently angry because an altar boy arrives late for Mass is left utterly helpless when he wishes to express

stern indignation in the presence of real iniquity. He should reserve great anger for great occasions, moderate anger for ordinary occasions, and the "small change of gentle dissatisfaction" for the trifling episodes of life. Superlative emotion is like the superlative degree in adjectives. If we waste our strongest adjectives on ordinary situations, we shall be unable to express supreme emotion when it is called for. Those who are cautious in the use of adjectives, always have words proportioned to situations. Making mountains out of molehills is an occupation not found in the life of a self-controlled priest. There is art in feeling, as there is in representations of beauty. The essence of it lies in the sense of proportion. It is the function of self-control to impart proportion to feeling and its expression. Its law is admirably stated in a sentence found in the Breviary on the feast of St. Hedwig: "Prudentia in agendis sic emicuit ut neque excessus esset in modo nec error in ordine."

A word might be said in particular about control of the emotion of fear, that subtle form of selfishness or self-consciousness that at times touches every spring of action in the heart. The psychologists tell us that fear is a "constant detail of life". One may have abnormal fear of criticism or of making mistakes or of inviting opposition. One may have an abnormal fear of pain or of loss of health or of misunderstanding. One may fear loss of prominence or diminished recognition. At any rate, the presence of fear is to be looked for in every life and its action may be suspected in many of our faults. A priest who gives serious attention to the problem of self-control will not neglect to study his fears and to become skillful in detecting their action and disguises at any point in his life. Self-control is not merely negative. It includes compulsion as well as restraint. It involves doing as well as not doing. It forces us to speak and act on occasion as well as to be silent and inactive on occasion. Fear harms us when we err through timidity and excessive caution.

The development of self-control requires reflection, effort, and prayer. This is self-evident. We are helped greatly by the habit of edification and of interpretation in our task. Much may be learned from our experience in life. One who learns by one's own mistakes will be quick to discover how many of

them are due to lack of self-control. The priest, however, is in a peculiar position in regard to this. There are certain features of his position in life which prevent him in a way from learning through experience as most men should.

The average man is greatly assisted in developing self-control by the experience of resistance. He lives and works among equals who challenge his judgment without apology and dissent from his views without fear. When our wisdom may be questioned and when resistance may express itself without the slightest hesitation, we learn gradually to keep our expressions of view or feeling within the lines where we can protect them. The experience of resistance of this kind tempers emotion among sensible men. Now the priest does not ordinarily meet a kind of resistance that will train him. He has the habit of authority and the resources of leadership. The faithful look to him with reverence, and they are silent when they disagree with him. A priest who does not reflect and who is not conscious of the processes that surround him is robbed of the wholesome discipline of resistance and is made the victim of his immunities. When this occurs, his self-control suffers.

Uncertainty in one's position is of much assistance in developing self-control. Men whose positions and income depend on the suppression of feeling develop self-control to a remarkable degree. Who has not known men to keep rage under perfect control lest they endanger their positions? Wherever we find employer and employed, the latter develops self-control in both feeling and expression just in proportion as income and position might be endangered through lack of it. Now the priest has not the discipline of insecurity in this sense. His position in the priesthood and his standing among fellow-priests, and for that matter his tenure of office, are practically secure to him. This security is to a great extent independent of his self-control. If from the standpoint now held in mind we may look upon the discipline of insecurity as a grace, we are compelled to admit that it is to a great extent denied to us in the priesthood. This is said, of course, under obvious reserve.

Another factor which develops self-control is the discipline of consequences. The average man is compelled to bear with

the penalties of his mistakes. While no man may escape this discipline, the priest does escape it to some extent. Hence the problem of developing self-control is made a little more difficult for him. The consequences of the mismanagement of the finances of a parish will be visited on the congregation when the priest may escape them. The merchant knows that his customers can punish him if he gives them occasion for complaint. The public official knows that he too can be made to suffer for a single imprudent display of temper or fault against courtesy. Vivid realization of consequences is always a discipline. Yet the priest escapes it to a marked degree.

The high-minded priest will not suffer because of these exemptions. He will draw insight, strength, and motive from his ideals. The sacredness of his office will inspire him. Its exemptions will but make him still more faithful to the spirit of God and to the duties of his priesthood, still more diffident of himself. He will not lack self-control. He will show it forth in a way that is infinitely charming and entirely to the credit of his priesthood. Borrowing a thought from George Eliot, a priest's celestial intimacies should shine forth in his domestic manners and his actions should declare the lofty aims that direct his life.

It is difficult to see how a priest can satisfy the elementary demands of his office if he fails to cultivate the habits of edification, interpretation, and self-control. It would be difficult to indicate the shares of grace and of temperament in this work. Grace has no fairer field in the world than the heart of a priest. Nothing is more difficult than to live near to the ideal, to be held to it, to be measured by it, to be its exponent and example. Nothing is more distressing than to fall short of the ideal when consecrated to it. Temperament is either a help or an obstacle in the priestly life. It is our duty to understand that and to find in this understanding help in the work of our sanctification.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

OUR SEMINARIES.

Preparatory Seminaries.

Of late years, there has been a pronounced tendency toward the multiplication of preparatory seminaries, both diocesan and religious. Cathedral colleges have been established in New York and Chicago, and similar institutions in several other cities. These establishments are classical colleges, and their curriculum, so far as it goes, does not differ substantially from the classical curriculum in the ordinary Catholic college or university. The chief difference lies in the specific purpose proposed for each student in these preparatory seminaries, and in the distinctly ecclesiastical atmosphere that is fostered. Only those are admitted, as a rule, who intend to enter the priesthood. The curriculum covers the two lower years of the college classical course and four years of high-school work.

In the endeavor, through the foundation of such institutions, to begin the work of forming fit candidates for the holy ministry at the age of from twelve to fourteen years, the Church in America is but carrying out one of the most important educational decrees of the Council of Trent.[1] Conditions have, in the past, hampered the development of this feature of the seminary system in this country, although the ideal has always been cherished, and some preparatory seminaries date their foundation from a very early period. Doubtless the future will witness a great increase in the number of these institutions. Their advantages are obvious. They help to afford a large number of vocations to the priesthood, and they contribute much to the attainment of that spirit of piety that must ever be foremost among the qualities requisite for the true minister of God.

These two reasons have had special influence with the heads of the religious orders. Coming less in contact with the people than the diocesan clergy, religious priests are at a certain disadvantage in the matter of recognizing and fostering vocations at an early age. It might seem that this disadvantage would be compensated for by the fact that Catholic colleges

[1] Cf. Session XXIII, c. 18; cf. Conc. Balt. Plen. III, n. 153.

are nearly all in the hands of the religious orders. Cannot the colleges, with their preparatory departments, supply plenty of vocations for the religious life? The experience of most of the orders furnishes a decidedly negative answer. The greater number of poor Catholic boys—taking the country as a whole—are shut out from any prospect of college education, and it is from the poorer clases, or at least those who are not so well-to-do, that the stream of priestly vocations, for both diocesan and religious life, has chiefly come. The larger Catholic colleges, if we except those conducted by the Jesuits, do not supply many candidates to their respective religious orders. The number of vocations is very small as compared with the total college attendance. The reason appears to be that, as has been said, college attendance is chiefly drawn from the upper and the middle classes; and also that the college atmosphere, while soundly religious and Catholic, is yet devoid of those special influences that are so easily realizable in the preparatory seminary. The atmosphere of the large college is usually more apt to engender in the youth the spirit of the ideal Catholic layman than the desire for the clerical or the religious life.

Again, if for the diocesan clergy preparatory seminary training is practically necessary for the sake of proper religious development, it is even more requisite for those who are to become priests in the religious orders. The discipline of the religious orders requires much more by way of preparation than that of the diocesan clerical life, and time is even a more important element in the preparatory training for the former. Most of the religious orders, therefore, count upon the preparatory seminary as the nursery of their religious life and spirit.

Sixteen religious orders have preparatory seminaries. A number of the larger orders have two, and several have three such institutions. Some of the smaller colleges are largely made up of candidates for the priesthood, and are thus practically preparatory seminaries. These are, however, generally listed as regular colleges.

Length of the Curriculum.

The entrance requirements for admission to seminaries in the United States were prescribed by the Third Plenary Coun-

cil of Baltimore, and involve the completion of the work of the preparatory seminary. This, as has been said, covers four years of high-school work and the two lower years of the college. Unfortunately, it is often found difficult to adhere to these prescriptions in practice, especially in the case of those who, on applying to the seminary, are found to be handicapped by reason of a late start in studies or otherwise, and who yet offer promising material for the clerical life. Such cases are not infrequent. Seminary men are alive to the importance of this problem, though no satisfactory solution has yet been suggested.[2]

The length of the diocesan seminary curriculum was definitely fixed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore: "In all seminaries the course of study shall embrace not fewer than six years, two of which shall be devoted to the study of philosophy and four to that of theology."[3] In the recent legislation enacted at Rome for the seminaries of religious orders throughout the world, practically the same length of time was required, it being declared in the decree *Auctis admodum* (4 November, 1893) that the study of theology should occupy four full years, after the completion of the regular curriculum of "other studies". These "other studies" were quite clearly defined by the Congregation for Religious in the "Declarationes circa Articulum Sextum Decreti *Auctis admodum*," dated 7 September, 1909:[4]

> The theological student does not fulfil the legal requirements if he has not previously gone through a full course of philosophical studies or studies of the lyceum; the same is true of the philosophical student, if he has not completed the regular curriculum of humanities or studies of the gymnasium; nor will the student of humanities be qualified legally if he has not had a primary education. Therefore, in order to pass legitimately from the primary schools to the gymnasium, and from the gymnasium to the lyceum, from the lyceum to the theological seminary, certificates are required which testify to successful tests or examinations.[5]

[2] Cf. Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, S.S., "The Intellectual Requirements for Entrance into the Seminary," in Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn., VI, pp. 449 ff.; also, Secretary's Report on same, in ibid., p. 447.

[3] Conc. Plen. Balt. III, n. 166.

[4] Cf. ECCL. REV., Vol. 41, pp. 729 ff.

[5] Ibid.

In the testimonial letters for ordination, the superiors must certify to the completion of the courses of study of the primary school, the gymnasium, and the lyceum, as well as those of the theological seminary. The years of study certified to must be full academic years. Doubling-up or shortening of courses is forbidden, and vacation study is not to count.

Several questions suggest themselves in regard to the meaning and scope of this legislation. The most important of these, probably, have to do with the translation of the declared and fixed standard into terms of our American educational system. The "gymnasium" and the "lyceum" do not exist among us. We may know something of the German gymnasium and the French lycée, but Americans are, with few exceptions, unfamiliar with the Italian system of education and its component elements.

Let it be supposed that an Italian boy and an American boy commence their primary schooling at the beginning of the seventh year. After five years of study, or at the beginning of the twelfth year, the Italian boy passes into the gymnasium, where he commences the study of Latin. Only three years later, or at the age of fifteen, does the American boy enter the high-school and begin Latin. The latter is thus three full years behind the former in taking up secondary studies and starting Latin. This is the most striking feature of the differences between the two systems, so far as we are now concerned. This advantage in time the Italian student carries right up to the seminary. Between the lyceum and the theological seminary there is supposed to be a year of "propedeutics" or preparation for theology, in the case of the candidate for the Italian seminary; between the American college and the theological seminary, a corresponding year of preparation is required before theology can be begun, so that the three years' difference in time would continue up to ordination, the Italian seminarian finishing at the end of his twenty-fourth year, while the American seminarian would finish only at the end of his twenty-seventh year. If the American candidate attended a preparatory seminary instead of a college, he would save the extra year required in philosophy or in special preparation for theology. The requirement of military service usually postpones ordination in Italy for a year.

The Italian boy studies Latin all through the five years of the gymnasium and the three years that follow in the lyceum, making eight years of Latin in all; and he spends quite as much time on Latin, both in and out of class, as does the American boy during his four years of Latin in the high school and the four years that follow in the college. In Italy, Greek is begun in the fourth year of the gymnasium, and continued through the lyceum and the year of "propedeutics" (if the latter be taken). This makes five or six years of Greek in all. The American student usually begins Greek in the first or second year of the high school, and carries it along till toward the end of the college course, giving a total of from six to eight years to this study. As to philosophy, it is begun by the Italian in the first year of the lyceum, at the age of seventeen,[6] and continued for three or four years, while in the American college philosophy is usually given during the three upper years of the college course. In the Italian government schools, only two hours a week are allotted to philosophy, during the three years of the lyceum; but boys destined for the seminary have to supplement this by two or three hours a week more, and, besides this, full five hours a week have to be devoted to it during the preparatory year of "propedeutics", if this be taken. The American Catholic college often gives more time to Greek than do the Italian government or church schools; but, on the other hand, some of our best colleges devote somewhat less time to Latin than do the Italian schools.

The American pupil gives three full years more to the primary branches than does the Italian pupil; this is the source of the loss of time in our system as compared with the Italian system. Suppose, now, that a candidate for a religious order is considerably above the ordinary age in beginning secondary studies (and this is very often the case), can the course in high school and college be lawfully shortened in his behalf? This is not easy to decide. The "Declarationes" evidently imply that the course of training in the humanities and philosophy in other countries will be practically equivalent to that afforded in Italy by the gymnasium and lyceum. But this does not necessarily mean that the one will be exactly equal in time to the

[6] It is supposed, for the sake of comparison, that the American boy and the Italian boy enter school at the age of seven.

other. As a matter of fact, our total pre-theological course is three years longer than the total pre-theological course in Italy, because we give three years more to the primary branches. Again, many preparatory seminaries of religious orders give but six years to the classics, passing the student thence to the two-year philosophical department of the seminary, where there is no formal study of either Latin or Greek. This represents but six years' study of Latin, as against the Italian eight years of Latin. Is this in accordance with the requirements of the new law? Or, is it requisite that Latin be studied for eight full years?

The letter of the law nowhere says this, nor does it appear to be necessarily implied. The emphasis is put upon the completion of the *entire regular course* of studies. But we have two different classical courses, as regards time, in this country. One of these, namely that which obtains in many of the preparatory seminaries, requires but six years; the other, followed in our colleges, requires eight years. It may be maintained that, so far as Latin and Greek are concerned, the six years' course is fully equivalent to the eight years' course, because of the special concentration, during the former, upon these studies. So far as regards the other studies of the classical course, outside of Latin, Greek, and philosophy, it does not appear that the work done by our American colleges is more advanced than the work done by the Italian gymnasiums and lyceums.

There are two changes which might, without great difficulty, be introduced into our educational system, and which would help to smooth the way that leads to the seminary. The first is a greater concentration upon Latin during the earlier years of its study. The Italian boy, even in the government schools, gives from five to seven class-hours a week to Latin during the first five years of its study, and only three hours a week during the last three years. This arrangement allows more time during the latter part of the course for the all-important study of philosophy. This change could be easily made in our colleges by affording an extra Latin class to boys looking forward to the seminary.

Another change would be the introduction of Latin into the seventh or even the sixth grade of the parish school. Dis-

tinguished non-Catholic educators have long been urging the teaching of the languages earlier in our system, and in many public schools they are now taught in the seventh and eighth grades. It would be easy to introduce a class of Latin into the seventh grade of every large parish school, for there are always boys in such a school who would take it, if it were offered. In many cases, boys' vocations are settled by that time; and many who at that age are still uncertain as to their vocation would take Latin, either because this would help them to make up their minds, or for general cultural purposes. In this way, two full years might be cut off the time required at present for the completion of the high school and college courses.[7]

New Studies

There is noticeable, in some of the larger and more progressive seminaries, a tendency to shift certain studies back to the two years of philosophy, whenever this can be done without prejudice to the theological course. In Scripture, for instance, a preliminary outline study of the sacred text is now made before theology is begun. The course in Scripture in the department of theology may thus be made more advanced and thorough; and the same is true of Church history. Many seminaries give such outline courses in Scripture and Church history during the years of philosophy. There is a growing disposition to throw the study of Hebrew and Biblical Greek back in the same way. Some seminaries continue the study of English along with philosophy, and to English are added, in certain instances, other modern languages.[8]

This policy has a very distinct value, not only in relieving an overcrowded theological curriculum, but also in making it possible for the seminary to take up certain new studies that the changing conditions of modern life appear to demand.

[7] For a discussion of the curriculum in American seminaries as compared with that in Italian seminaries, cf. the paper by the Rev. H. J. Heuser, in Ann. Report Cath. Ed. Assn., X, p. 455.

[8] Cf. Very Rev. P. R. Heffron, "The Four Years' Course of Theology," in Ann. Report Cath. Ed. Assn. for 1906, pp. 211 ff.; also the Rev. F. P. Siegfried, "The Department of Philosophy in the Seminary," in ibid., X, pp. 481 ff.; Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, S.S., "The Intellectual Requirements for Entrance into the Seminary," in ibid., VI, p. 449; and papers by the Rev. J. C. Herrick and the Rev. G. V. Leahy, on "Science in the Seminary," ibid., VI, pp. 455 ff

Among these may be mentioned pedagogy, social and political science, and higher classics, especially Latin writing. It needs no argument to prove that every priest who stands at the head of a parish school ought to know something of the science and the art of teaching.[9] In the case of the social and political sciences, too, it is self-evident that the pastor who labors in the city needs to have a knowledge which will be sufficiently extensive to make him acquainted with the vital facts of current social and economic conditions, tendencies, and doctrines; a knowledge which will be sufficiently stimulating to give him a lasting interest in these phenomena, and which will be sufficiently thorough to enable him to deal intelligently, justly, and charitably with the practical situations that he will be compelled to face afterward.[10] As to Latin, there is need in every diocese for at least one or several priests who can write Latin fluently and correctly, if not elegantly. There is necessary correspondence between the diocesan chanceries and Rome; and much of this, being official in character, has to be in the official language of the Church. The course of classics in our colleges or seminary philosophical departments does not suffice to give this facility in Latin writing, even in the case of the more clever men. Hence the need for some supplementary training in this way during the theological course. It has been suggested that the need could best be met by the formation of a select class during the last year or two of the theological course for the purpose of this higher classical study.

In the larger seminaries, it would be easy to arrange for a course of lectures in pedagogy, as well as in social and political science, by competent professional men from outside. Something, in fact, has already been done in this way. A weekly lecture in each of these subjects, if followed up, in the class of moral or pastoral theology, by a more special and thorough application of the principles set forth, would not be likely to add unduly to the burden of regular seminary work,

[9] Cf. the Rev. E. P. Duffy, "The Teaching of Pedagogy in the Seminary," in Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn., II, p. 238; also papers by Very Rev. E. A. Pace, the Rev. F. J. Van Antwerp and the Rev. F. V. Corcoran, on "The Seminary and the Educational Problem," in ibid., VIII, pp. 470 ff.; cf. also Resolutions of Seminary Dept. in ibid., p. 468.

[10] The Rev. John A. Ryan, "The Study of Social Problems in the Seminary," in Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn., V, p. 450.

while it would probably be sufficient to awaken in regard to these matters an intellectual interest that would lead to much fuller knowledge of them later on.

Seminary and College.

One of the most acute problems in Catholic education has to do with the relations of the seminary and the college. From the point of view of the ideal condition, it would seem that their relations ought to be made such that the young man who completes a college education and desires to be a priest, could pass into the seminary after getting his college degree of A. B., and begin at once the study of theology. This is not, however, the case in practice. The college graduate, after his two years, or two and a half years, of philosophy in the A. B. course, has to spend at least one year more in the philosophical department of the seminary, before being allowed to begin theology. A full year of time is thus lost to the young man by his taking the college course instead of making his collegiate studies in the preparatory seminary and the seminary. This is a serious disadvantage to the Catholic college, and it is becoming constantly more serious. There is a growing general feeling that the present college course of four years, in view of the three or four years of professional training that may have to follow, is too long, and unduly retards the entrance of the young man upon his professional career, whether it be that of lawyer, doctor, or clergyman. To lengthen out this period further by a full year (and a year to be largely given to repeating things already seen during the college course) seems, on the face of things, to argue a lack of proper coördination between the work of the seminary and the college.

One result of this condition will be to keep prospective clerical students away from the college altogether, or to cause them to quit the college after the sophomore year and go to the seminary, before beginning philosophy. But would this be a bad thing? Would it not be better, all round, if this were generally done? College men, looking to the interests of the college, would answer the question in a decided negative. It is unquestionably to the interest of the college to have a good sprinkling of prospective clerical students among its group of young men. They constitute one of the very best elements

in the student body, and wield a powerful influence toward keeping the moral and religious level of college life up to the Catholic ideal. Intellectually, too, they are apt to furnish many leaders. Their loss, even during the last two years of the course, would therefore be felt as a serious blow. Moreover, there is always a class of boys at college who remain more or less in doubt about their clerical vocation until the very end of their course; and there are some who are able to make up their minds decisively only after they have left the college with their degree. This latter condition will aways ensure the presence of a certain number of boys in the college who will afterward enter the seminary. And it would be too much to expect that the college will not, as a rule, encourage prospective clerical students to remain at college until the completion of their course, whatever the attitude of the seminary.

On the other hand, there are strong reasons for the seminary's attitude in requiring college graduates to make an additional year of philosophy. There is the matter of philosophy itself. The college course, it is contended, being designed for laymen, need not be, and usually is not, as full and thorough as is imperatively required for the candidate for theology. Then, too, there are other pre-theological studies that the college graduate misses, notably, Scripture and Church history. Finally, there is the matter of spiritual training for the holy priesthood which cannot be given in three or four years and for which the period of five or six years ordinarily required in the seminary is short enough. Indeed, some seminary authorities have gone so far as to say that, even outside the question of studies, two years of spiritual training that are missed by the college graduate would alone constitute sufficient reason for the requirement of an additional year before beginning theology.[11]

[11] Cf. the discussion of this question at the meeting of the Cath. Ed. Assn. at St. Paul in 1915, in Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn., including papers by the Rev. J. P. O'Mahoney, C.S.V., and the Right Rev. Mgr. J. B. Peterson, on "Relations between Cath. Seminaries and Cath. Colleges," from the standpoint of the college and the seminary respectively; also, papers by the Rev. Bernard Feeney, "Where Clerics are to Study Philosophy," and the Rev. F. V. Corcoran, C.M., "The Need of a Peculiarly Ecclesiastical Intellectual Training covering a Longer Period than the Course of Theology in the Seminary."

There is evidently a grave problem here which can be solved only by bringing to its consideration the best thought and the ripest wisdom of the leaders in college and seminary education. It is of the utmost importance for the future of Catholic education that such an acute disarrangement in the relations of the two topmost branches in the Catholic system should be obviated. The condition involves needless waste of time and energy on the part of the student, while it threatens to draw away from the college, in large part, its best class of students.

The question may well be raised as to whether it is not to the benefit of the Church to have a portion of the clergy trained in classics and philosophy in the college or university atmosphere. A certain breadth of view and roundness of intellectual interests is apt to be derived from college and university conditions, and when to this is added the highly specialized theological and pastoral training of the seminary, it would seem that we have the most perfect combination of educational elements for the development of the broad-minded, scholarly priest. I am supposing, of course, that sufficient philosophy may be given in the college or university, and that the matter of spiritual training and direction may be provided for there as well as it could be in the seminary. There can be no question, it seems to me, that gifted minds would find better intellectual opportunities in the large college or university than they could find in the seminary; and it will always be one of the important duties of the Church to provide, to the very best of her ability, for the training of those who by voice or pen or position are destined to be the leaders in her work. The atmosphere of the seminary is necessarily that of a highly specialized institution. It is calculated to develop, not so much breadth of view, as intellectual efficiency along certain necessary lines. The seminary provides admirably for the philosophical training of the greater body of the clergy; but it would not be to the best interests of even the seminary itself were it to be deprived of the college graduates that have always formed part of its student body. It is, in fact, a question as to whether even a larger number of seminarians might not profitably procure, before entering upon the study of theology, the advantages of a full college education.

In the executive board of the Catholic Educational Association, the condition has been much discussed of late years by representatives of the seminaries and colleges. In 1914 a joint committee was appointed to consider the problem. During the meeting of the Association at St. Paul in July, 1915, the committee met, but was unable to agree upon any plan that would eliminate the difficulties involved in the strict coordination of the work of the seminary and college. At the meeting of the Seminary Department, in fact, after the discussions of the joint committee, it was unanimously resolved not to admit college graduates to first-year theology without their making at least one year more of philosophy in the seminary, even though they had already had two years of philosophy in the college.[12] It is evident that further progress in the settlement of the question will depend on the colleges. The position of the seminaries is fixed and, so far as the substance of the matter is concerned, entirely reasonable. The colleges must provide special spiritual training and discipline for those young men among its student body who are looking forward to the priesthood.

It would lead us beyond our scope to discuss in detail how this might be done most effectively; but there is evidently no inherent impossibility in the doing of it by the college. Why, for instance, should not such young men be grouped together in a separate hall, under seminary rules? This is often done at European universities. In the matter of philosophy, too, why should not the college or university offer courses in scholastic philosophy for the special benefit of prospective ecclesiastical students? These courses might be in Latin, and this fact would render unnecessary the continuance of the Latin classics, a result that would allow time for a greater concentration upon philosophy. Were these changes introduced by the colleges, there would probably be no difficulty in their arranging with the seminaries for the admission of their graduates at once into the theological courses. And such changes would very likely result in drawing prospective clerics in larger numbers to the colleges, besides strengthening and developing the curriculum.

[12] Cf. Summary of joint discussion, and Resolutions of Seminary Dept., at St. Paul, in Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn., 1915, pp. 518 ff.

There is no reason why Hebrew and outline-courses of Scripture and Church history might not also be introduced into the colleges.

EQUIPMENT.

The movement that has brought such great improvement in the material equipment of Catholic schools, academies and colleges, during the past two decades, has been evident likewise in the seminaries. Some of the larger secular seminaries now compare favorably, in point of buildings and equipment, with our best colleges and universities. The new Kenrick Seminary at St. Louis, and the archdiocesan seminaries of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Paul, and San Francisco are built upon modern plans, and, together with all reasonable provisions for health and comfort, they combine large and commodious library and chapel accommodations. In many other instances, where there has not been a complete reconstruction of the seminary plant, new buildings have been erected or extensions of old ones made, new sanitary arrangements installed, a better cuisine provided for, and large additions made to the library. Similar reconstructions or improvements have also been made in the case of the preparatory seminaries. The seminaries of religious, being smaller, have not so generally evidenced this movement toward material progress. Some of the larger orders, however, have entirely reconstructd their seminary establishments, and the magnificent group of religious seminaries round the Catholic University at Washington offer examples of material equipment that are unexcelled. The conveniences and comparative comforts of seminary life at present, as contrasted with the almost complete absence of anything ministering to comfort a few generations ago, have raised doubts in the minds of some of the older clergy as to whether the tendency toward material improvement is not being carried too far. The fear is that the newly ordained priest, coming out from our fine modern establishments, may not have had sufficient inculcation of the spirit of self-sacrifice and mortification, which is so essential to priestly life and work. There is, undoubtedly, a real danger here; but there can be no doubt, either, that the improvement in the seminaries on the material side represents genuine—

one might say, necessary—progress, and that the danger apprehended may be effectively met by means that are always readily at hand.

JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C.

Washington, D. C.

THE PERSONIFICATION OF LAW.

BY rapidily swinging in a circle a point of fire a whole circle of fire is seen. This optical illusion is due to the sluggishness of the retina which does not drop at once the received impression of the fire but retains it until the fire comes round again to renew the impression. As the same phenomenon takes place at every point of the circle, the illusion of the circle of fire is created. Man's imagination suffers, or, if you will, is endowed with a similar illusion. But it is not sluggishness in letting go the impression but alertness in running ahead of it that creates the illusion of the imagination. The ancients from the clusters of scintillating points in the nightly sky by imagination filled out the pictures of the Bear, the Serpent, the Charioteer, the Winged Horse, and so on. They were children and acted like the little boy who, seeing his hobby-horse in many points to be like a real horse, by imagination completes the circle and proceeds to whip, to caress, and otherwise to treat his hobby as if it were animated. This power to personify is, when properly used, a rhetorical instrument of great force. Our Saviour, who called remorse "the worm that dieth not", did not disdain to use it. It has likewise been the source of the most widespread error, and in no field has it done more harm than in the personification of Law.

Law has been by personification again and again torn from the hands of the lawgiver and made literally to go on all fours, a monster with teeth and claws of steel. Truth has again and again combated this monster. But the combat never ceases. We are reminded of that haunting Arabian tale of the fisherman who found a bottle which was washed up by the sea, and sealed with the seal of Solomon. When the fisherman broke the seal a tiny wisp of smoke issued forth which soon unfolded a malignant and threatening spirit.

The fisherman managed to coax back the spirit, and then once for all he threw the bottle back into the sea. The malignant spirit of personified law has again and again been bottled up by truth. But again and again the seal of Solomon has been broken, and it has issued forth once more.

In our day much is done to hold back the law of the land from becoming personified and to keep it, what it is in fact, a provisional formula expressive of the will of the lawgiver. Hence we have supreme courts, which are courts of equity; hence we have our pardoning boards which take up considerations not allowed even to courts. These devices bring back law to the genuine will of the lawgiver. In civil law no man thinks that a transaction is secure unless the law under which the transaction has been made, has been tested in all the courts. He is afraid that some sort of logic may draw out of the law what the lawgiver did not put into it. In this respect a shrewd real-estate dealer might teach some modern philosophers a good lesson on the provisional character of a formula of law. History shows that in the Church it is rather the mind of the lawgiver than the wording of the formula that is in the last resort binding. When "the whole world groaned and marveled to find itself Arian", its groan and its astonishment were evoked by the formula of the Rimini decree, not by the mental decree of the majority of the bishops. In other words, the will of the lawgiver lives in the law as long as it is law, and the formula has no native power to defeat it. The law, although it has an objectivity, does not live by force of its formula and independently of the legislator. While the will of the legislator is presumed to be always the same, the formula by which the will is expressed may need some additional bridling as circumstances change. Otherwise, like the maddened steed with the bit in its teeth, it works havoc. St. Paul's distinction of the letter and the spirit expresses the same idea. When the spirit of the lawgiver is excluded from the law, its formula is personified into an unfeeling and inconsiderate tyrant. Let us consider the personification of the law in the West and in the East, in ancient and in modern times.

The first personification of the law in the West was in the doctrine of Fate. The "fatum" was the law of all things;

Ειριμηνη Μοῖρα was the lot assigned to all things. Its conception rose by a natural process of the human mind personifying law. No doubt the idea of the Deity and of Providence was handed down from primitive tradition. But according as the idea of God became enfeebled through gross perversion, the idea of a governing law, by the steady recurrence of natural phenomena, was strengthened until at last all—gods, man, and the universe —were held in its inexorable grasp. The introduction of the three fates, Clotho, Lachesis, Atropos, was but a development in personification.

Christianity came, and by teaching us the true conception of God, all-wise, all-good, and almighty, it excluded at once the pagan conception of fate. But the smoke of that evil spirit remained long after he was bottled up. The popular mind was so obsessed with the idea of fate that the Fathers considered it worth while to write whole treatises on the subject, and as late as the thirteenth century St. Thomas wrote the question " De Fato ".

After the doctrine of fate the ancient theory of numbers may be set down as the next great illusion of the mind eager to complete the circle from a few observed resemblances. The exact and necessary sequence in numbers was observed to have a certain correspondence with the sequence of cause and effect as seen in sowing and in harvesting, in the return of the seasons, in the movements of the stars, and in all generations and corruptions. Hence it was inferred not only that there is law in all things as inexorable as in numbers, but that all things are numbers, and conversely the knowledge of things can be deduced from numbers. The modern application of mathematics to problems of physics is in no sense the fruit of this theory of Crotona. The ancient doctrine of numbers lingered long in the world, and was productive of all sorts of attempts to magnify the significance of ages, dates, and all kinds of enumerations. We shall see it again in considering the doctrines of the East.

In modern times the speculations of mathematicians on the fourth dimension have been utilized by spiritualists to promote their peculiar tenets. Because the algebraist has a formula for the fourth dimension, these fantastic people at once conclude that a place with four dimensions exists. They go

further and say that, just as a person who utilizes the three dimensions by rising in the air can see more than another who, being confined in a surface, could utilize only two; so the disembodied souls released and taken out of this world of three dimensions and ushered into that of four, are endowed with wonderful knowledge. As the eagle's vision transcends the ant's, so does the vision of the dweller in the world of four dimensions transcend ours. These theories are only visions of their restless imagination, which makes an unrealizable formula of algebra a reality of great significance.

The engraving of laws on bronze and the engrossing of them on enduring parchment tended to hypostatize them and to liberate them from the lawgiver. In the course of time the source of law may be lost sight of, just as the whole metric system relies for its veracity not any longer on a ten-millionth part of the distance from the pole to the equator, but upon the platinum bar deposited in the archives of the International Metric Commission, which was to represent that part but now does not. It would involve endless confusion to bring all the metric measures once more into conformity with that first plan, and therefore the plan will not be carried out. Some laws exist by the same sort of permission of the legislator. He would wish to change them, but he recoils from the task. But in the end the task must be taken up, and law once more made a fit expression of the lawgiver's will. A truth of law couched in a formula full of flattery for the executive is peculiarly dangerous. Its truth holds the sincere man long after the words of flattery have made it a source of corruption. "The king can do no wrong," "the divine right of kings", are formulas which state the truth that the State can not be sued, and that all authority is from God. But how subject these formulas are to be distorted into other senses, and how difficult to keep them within their only true sense! The long contest of common law with the Roman law in England illustrates the difficulty of dethroning legal formulas which no longer express adequately the will of the lawgiver.

The history of medicine is the history of aberrations of the imagination in the field of therapy on account of imaginary laws. From a few phenomena laws were deduced, and in turn the poor victims of leeches were tortured on account of the

exigencies of law. Blood-letting, good perhaps in some cases, was made of universal application. Scalding oil for wounds was used till the oil gave out, and it was noticed that the wounds healed better without observing the law. The value of a dose was assumed from one or two instances to grow with the dose, hence there were doctors who gorged their victims with drugs. Or *vice versa* the opposite procedure gave some good results, hence the theory of Hahnemann that the more the drug is divided the more potent it becomes. He carried his theory so far that in the end he believed that the odor, and the slightest odor at that, would effect the greatest cure. Hence he held an infinitesmal pellet to the nostrils when the patient was asleep. The theory of the four humors, of the signatures, of the archæons, of the three constituents of the human body, made many victims of imaginary laws. Now in all these cases a complete induction was assumed; the law was deduced and then it was supposed to work automatically. From our present standpoint of serum therapy, what an empty phantom was all the medical science of the past! what complete nonentities were the laws invoked! what a lesson to us not to transfer to the world of reality the plausible fictions of the mind and to expect nature to work according to the logic of these fictions! But in some quarters the lesson was never learned.

Whosoever has studied the subject of miracles, knows that the great objection against them comes from the personification of law. Up to a certain point an induction is made. Care is taken to leave out of that induction the miraculous facts in Sacred History duly recorded and attested. Natural law thus springs into the arena armed cap-à-pie; it is inexorable; and it presents a barrier against the intervention of God in His universe. It is only a mental classification which will be broadened by those who come after us, yet it is made to bind the hands of the Creator. It is only a fabric of the human mind and it is advanced as capable of marring the plans of the Divine Mind.

Some physicists regarded the comets as performing the function of knitting together the various systems of the stellar universe. It is a noble conception. Our solar system, for instance, according to this theory, with its many planets and

planetoids of different size, density, orbit, and velocity, is at a given point of time in danger of losing its equilibrium. Lo! from afar comes in the form of a comet rushing through space just that weight which is required to restore the balance again. Thus sun is bound to sun, stellar system to stellar system, and all is held in unity. If such were the case it would but be a picture of the natural and supernatural orders as they are bound together by miracles and prophecy.

Scarcely were the disciples of Hume confuted when Darwin and Wallace once more broke the seal of Solomon, and out popped several devils more malignant than all their predecessors. "Natural selection," "variation," "survival of the fittest," "palingenesis" assumed in the imagination of men a power to be compared with that of God, whom they rejected. Furthermore, just according as law became a god, scientists seemed to lose their wits and mere description with them became an energizing law. Did not Grant Allen roll all the other thaumaturgic genii into this one of description when he said: "The watercrab crawls to land and proceeds to get lungs?" Did not Carl Schneider do the same when he said: "The different parts of a coral polyp react equally well to any outside influence. But very early in the scale a difference begins to appear; we find what answers to a head and body, or root and stalk. The leaves of a plant will turn toward the light; so will the head of a silk-worm. The parts take on special duties and powers. And with this come the rudiments of a nervous system." It is very simple; mere description tells the whole sequence of cause and effect. Our museum directors promote the illusion when they arrange vehicles in order, all the way from the primitive cart with wheels made from a round of a tree to the modern locomotive with wheels made of steel, or when they arrange edifices from the primitive hut raised on poles to the Grecian temple raised on pillars of fluted marble. But the old cart and the primitive hut remain what they were. It was the mind outside of them that with new materials gradually planned and executed greater works in which the first plan was still preserved. There is no reason to suppose that it is different in living things. The primitive forms still exist. It is imagination that gives to the law of evolution alone a power to lift the lowest to the highest in the rank of species.

The modern man therefore is as much in the thrall of his imagination as the ancient. His laws, when he leaves the domain of civics, have become as inexorable as fate or numbers. In rounding out the circle from a few points he is as adept but not so poetic as his ancient confrère, who in the orbs of the October sky saw the Serpent ever reaching after the crown, Bears prowling around the Polar Star, and, not to mention the other animals, the Twins playing teeter-totter on the rim of the universe.

But Asia was the peculiar home of the imagination. "Asiatic" even to those ancient romancers of the stars meant florid. We shall next take a glance at the personification of law in the East.

JAMES C. BYRNE.

St. Paul, Minn.

THE MORALITY OF ANTI-CONCEPTIVE DEVICES.

THE recently issued Report of the British National Birth-rate Commission on the declining birth-rate contains much that is of great interest to Catholics, and especially to the clergy. It is very plain-spoken indeed on certain sexual matters which have suffered somewhat in the past from a conspiracy of silence. Just now the pendulum seems to be swinging in the opposite direction, and excess of plain speaking threatens to produce greater evils than ever silence produced. Very difficult and delicate problems connected with sex morality are being openly discussed in the daily and weekly press, and the public are invited to form their own opinions on the questions raised. The writers know well on which side popular sentiment is likely to be found and naturally they adopt a tone and maintain views which will be acceptable to the majority of their readers. The questions certainly are of the greatest importance and should be treated somewhere. That is my reason for offering this contribution to the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW which addresses itself to an exclusive circle—that is to priests whose influence in matters of this kind is likely to be effective for good.

The above-mentioned Report corroborates what was well known already, that the birth-rate of England and Wales has

declined by about one-third during the last forty years. It is still declining, and in all probability we have not touched bottom yet by any means. Some authorities profess to find matter for satisfaction in this fact. Dr. Havelock Ellis has publicly reproved the "panic-stricken fanatics" who preach to the people that the birth-rate is falling and the nation is decaying. The first witness examined by the Commission was Dr. C. V. Drysdale, the Secretary of the Malthusian League. Dr. Drysdale took the opportunity to say something about the Malthusian League, which he represented, and of which he is the Secretary. He told the Commission that the League has carried on a propaganda in favor of family restriction ever since the Bradlaugh and Besant trial in 1876; the time at which the birth-rate began to decline in England and Wales. The central principle of the Neo-Malthusian movement is the doctrine of Malthus, that unrestricted reproduction inevitably leads to pressure upon subsistence, with its consequences—poverty, starvation, prostitution, disease, and war. At first, English Neo-Malthusians confined their operations to expositions of the economic, moral, and eugenic aspects of the population question. Until 1913 they refused to give information concerning preventive devices. In that year, however, says Dr. Drysdale, "following upon recent authoritative medical pronouncements, in favor of such devices, the League has instituted a practical propaganda, with special precautions against abuse." He gives a descriptive definition of Neo-Malthusianism which embodies the principles to which the League has constantly adhered:

> Neo-Malthusianism is an ethical doctrine based on the principle of Malthus, that poverty, disease, and premature death can only be eliminated by control of reproduction, combined with a recognition of the evils inseparable from prolonged abstention from marriage. It, therefore, advocates nearly universal early marriage, together with a selective limitation of offspring to those children to whom the parents can give a satisfactory heredity and environment, so that they may become desirable members of the community. It further maintains that a universal knowledge of hygienic contraceptive devices among adult men and women would in all probability automatically lead to such a selection through enlightened self-interest, and thus to the elimination of destitution and all the more serious social evils, and to the elevation of the race.

Open-air campaigns have been held to disseminate these views in the large towns, and a pamphlet is being distributed gratuitously describing the most hygienic methods of limiting families. The ordinary layman can hardly be expected to form a sound judgment on these important questions when they are proposed to him in that guise. It makes one thank God devoutly for the guidance which the Church gives us, and it makes us realize the necessity of that guidance.

I do not wish to suggest that the Neo-Malthusian League is alone responsible for the decline in the birth-rate. It is clear from the Report that direct procuring of abortion, and venereal diseases, such as gonorrhœa and syphilis, are largely responsible as well. The Neo-Malthusians deplore these causes, as all sensible men must do. Nor are they alone in their advocacy of such preventive devices as they consider harmless. The Report acknowledges that "among conscientious and high-minded laymen and women in the Anglican Church there are many who openly justify the use of preventives," and this attitude has become far more common during the last few years (page 64). The Report further adds:

> We regret that we are unable to present a definite pronouncement as to the physical consequences of the use of these devices. The printed evidence which follows does not enable a dogmatic statement to be made as to these; and in view of the fact that medical investigation on this subject is difficult and in large measure has only recently been made, it is not surprising that no definite medical conclusion can be drawn (page 57).

Twenty-four of the Commissioners signed an Addition to the Report which, among other things, acknowledges that there are some questions "which deserve more thorough and general consideration than we have been able to give to them." Among these is the following: "Is any mode of restriction except voluntary abstinence from marital relations moral and religious?" There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that there is one other lawful mode of restriction besides voluntary abstinence from marital relations. Married couples may, if they like, limit intercourse to the inter-menstrual periods, when conception is less likely to take place. The Anglican Bishop of Southwark, in his evidence given before

the Commission, expressed the opinion that this practice is unlawful. He failed, however, to substantiate his view, and it is opposed to the Memorandum drawn up by a Committee of Anglican Bishops and endorsed by a majority of their number. Medical authorities are not agreed as to whether the practice is likely to be effectual in preventing conception, but there seems to be no valid reason against it from the point of view of moral theology. I do not propose to discuss this question further. Catholic moral theology clearly condemns the use of all anti-conceptional methods by married people who use their marital rights. There is a more heinous malice in the voluntary procuring of abortion after conception than in the use of anti-conceptive devices. Some anti-conceptive devices are more injurious than others. But there are none that are not immoral and wrong, according to the teaching of Catholic moral theology. Can this be shown by reasons that will appeal to the ordinary man or woman of sound common-sense? That is what I want to show in this paper.

I have already referred to the article contributed to an English weekly newspaper by Dr. Havelock Ellis. He is of considerable standing in the world of science, and so his views are of interest to us. He maintains that small families and a falling birth-rate are not only not evil, but that they are a positive good. They represent an evolutionary rise in nature and a higher stage in civilization. It is the lower forms of animals that are most prolific and the higher forms that are less so. Vast quantities of lower forms of life are born, but natural selection, by its rough methods, takes care that only the fittest should survive. In the higher forms of animal life quality takes the place of quantity. The elephant has far fewer offspring than the herring, but it more than makes up for the difference by greater parental care. This evolutionary process becomes conscious and deliberate in man without ceasing to be natural. We will here give his own words:

> It is, then, that we have what may properly be termed *Birth Control*. That is to say, that a process which had before been working steadily through the ages, attaining every new forward step with waste and pain, is henceforth carried out voluntarily in the light of the high human qualities of reason and foresight and self-restraint.

This statement seems to be in direct opposition to fact. The natural process kills off the unfit in the struggle for life, and so only the fittest survive. A couple who use preventive devices use an unnatural process without the means of knowing what the result is to be. Of the possible children that they might have had, the two or three that are born may very possibly be the weakest and the least gifted by nature. At any rate the parents can exert no choice as to the quality. They can indeed limit the quantity by restrictive devices, but if we follow the teaching of experience the two or three children are as likely as not to be spoiled by over-indulgence and by having all the hardships of life removed out of their path. The best and the strongest characters, as a rule, are developed in the bosom of large families, which preclude pampering and necessitate a certain simplicity of life. It is a mere abuse of language to speak of the use of preventives as the employment of reason, foresight, and self-restraint. It is irrational, blind, and the absence of all restraint.

It is difficult to understand how Dr. Havelock Ellis could possibly maintain that a falling birth-rate is not an evil but a positive good. A people living in simple conditions of life without rivals or powerful neighbors to fear might perhaps be satisfied if the birth-rate and death-rate more or less balanced. There would be no great cause for alarm if such a balance of births and deaths were the effect of natural causes. But those are not the conditions of the problem before us. There is a keen rivalry among the great nations of the world, and the declining birth-rate among the chief European nations is largely due to preventive devices. The process has been going on in France for something like two centuries, and France furnishes our great object-lesson of its effect on national welfare. In the seventeenth century France was the acknowledged leader among the nations of Europe. At that time her population was 38 per cent of the total population of the chief European nations. At the end of the eighteenth century it had fallen to 27 per cent. In 1815 it was 20 per cent; in 1880 it was 13 per cent, and now it is about 11 per cent. Instead of being the most populous nation of Europe, France now takes the sixth or seventh place. It is patent to everyone what this has meant in the Great War. Man for

man, the Frenchman believes himself superior to the German, but the forty millions of France are no match in arms against the sixty-five millions of Germany. Quantity of population undoubtedly is a factor of great influence on national welfare, and a declining birth-rate can only be viewed with alarm by a true and far-sighted patriot.

Moral turpitude cannot be gauged by the physically evil effects which follow from it and can be verified. An evil desire to commit adultery does not entail the physical and verifiable evils that follow from actual adultery. And yet "Whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart". The moral turpitude of an evil desire is the same in kind as that of the evil act itself. The ancient Romans used emetics after one dinner in order to be able to enjoy the pleasures of a second and third on the same day. The physically evil effects of the practice were perhaps not very serious if it was not indulged in too frequently. There are few that would not allow that such an action is disgusting, unnatural, and inordinate. It is immoral and wrong apart from any physically evil effects that it may have. If it were indulged in very frequently it would lead to a permanent derangement in the action of the stomach. These principles are applicable in a special degree to sexual excesses. In the natural use of marriage a legitimate outlet is provided for the strongest of the instincts and appetites of mankind. A sense of satisfaction follows upon the use of marital rights. There may be intemperance in such use, and intemperance will be the cause of physical evil, more or less serious. But the temperate use is accompanied with satisfaction, and after a time leads to a gradual weakening of the sexual appetite. This is not true of the abuse of the sexual appetite. Let us take a well-known example which has been studied by theologians and by medical men for centuries. A solitary act or two of self-abuse may not have any serious physical evil as its consequence. But if constantly repeated, it destroys health of body and of mind. It is generally accompanied by some physical pleasure, but it does not give complete satisfaction. This leads to a constant temptation to repeat the act, repetition leads to a strengthening of the habit and the craving for indulgence, and the yielding to this leads

to a gradual weakening of self-control and to the ruin of health of mind and body. This is the rational argument by which theologians defend and illustrate their teaching concerning the deadly malice of one sin of self-abuse.

When preventive devices are used in sexual intercourse there is self-abuse and abuse of the other party as well. The act is satisfying for neither of them except for the moment; an appetite is created, not satisfied, and the natural consequences of self-abuse follow for both to a greater or less extent. There are not the same facilities for over-indulgence, and so the evil effects of the practice are not so rapid and conspicuous, but in a measure they are there. This is fully borne out by the first-hand experience of several of the medical witnesses examined by the Commission. Thus Dr. Amand Routh said:

> I have no doubt that prevention of maternity by *artificial* methods invariably produces physical, mental, and, I think, moral, harm to those who resort to it—to one, or probably to both. . . . I am sure it does harm to both, if they both agree to it. The act is incomplete; it is not a spontaneous act; and if the act ceases before the proper crisis, as it were, the nervous system suffers enormously if the habit is continued for long. And the result often is that there is a great deal of congestion produced in the woman, at all events. I know nothing about the physical results in the case of the man, but in the woman the result is that the pelvic organs become congested and catarrhal, the womb becomes enlarged, and the result is that later on, when the parents are perhaps better off and want a child, they are not able to have one (page 247).

The Chairman, the Very Rev. Dean Inge, put a question to the witness on this subject. He asked: "You say in your lecture, 'Every method of artificial prevention of conception is harmful in both its physical and moral effect.' That is, of course, by no means universally admitted, is it? It is a matter of very great importance to this Commission." Dr. Routh answered:

> Well, personally, I believe that every *artificial* method does do physical harm, with the only exception that supposing the husband uses letters, for instance, I do not think the harm is very much to the wife, except that she misses the stimulating effect of the semen itself. And there is not the least doubt that that has a very powerful effect;

it is absorbed to a certain extent, and seems to stimulate and even to nourish the woman in a way which we do not at present understand.

"I think," pursued Dr. Inge, "it will be generally admitted, as far as I can make out, that withdrawal is mischievous; but we have been told that the use of these other things which you mention is harmless to both sexes. That is what I want to get at." Dr. Routh replied:

> Well, I am sure that people who use letters suffer from it in time. It is not the same thing. It is difficult to explain how it does act, but I am only speaking of practical experience with one's patients who have adopted these methods. To begin with, supposing that both the man and the woman are very much averse to having a child. It is not a normally conducted physiological act at all; it is an act accompanied more or less by fear the whole time, and the nervous system cannot stand being, thus, in anything rather than the passive attitude of affection which ought to exist.

Asked if that effect was not mental rather than physical, the witness replied: "It is mental, but it has a physical effect. You cannot have the nervous system in this state of dread without a physical effect."

A further question was put: "You would agree, I take it, that there is a difference of opinion among experienced gynecologists on this point, as to the deleterious physical effects of the use of these artificial means?" To which Dr. Routh replied: "I thought everybody considered they were more or less harmful" (page 254).

Another witness of experience, Dr. Mary Scharlieb, was asked: "Are you of opinion that injury does result from the use of these preventives?" To which she replied: "No physical injury. In the majority of cases they cannot do physical harm to anyone. From the use by the wife of a douche or a quinine pessary, or from the use by the husband of a sheath, I do not see that any physical injury results, but I am sure there are recondite effects upon the nervous system."

To the question: "Having regard to hysteria and allied diseases, would you not agree that although physical injury may not be present, yet nevertheless serious injury does arise?" The witness replied, "Certainly" (page 271).

When, therefore, the Commissioners express regret in their Report that they are unable to present a definite pronouncement as to the physical consequences of the use of preventive devices, we may presume that they use the word "physical" in a restricted sense as distinguished from nervous and mental evils. Catholic writers on Pastoral Theology have long insisted on the grievous harm done to body and mind by the use of preventive devices. An increase of fornication, too, is said to take place when the fear of offspring is removed by the use of preventive methods.

Clement of Alexandria lived at a time of great moral depravity, and Alexandria was probably as bad as any other city of the Roman Empire. He was acquainted with all the learning of his time, and especially was he a keen student of human nature. In an interesting passage he tells us that defilement of the marriage bed leads to loss of mutual respect and of conjugal love. I will finish my article by a translation of a few sentences:

It is not shameful for us to mention for the instruction of our hearers the parts in which the conception of the fetus takes place and which God was not ashamed to make. . . . Now, marriage is the desire for the procreation of children, not the inordinate effusion of seed, which is contrary to precept and against right reason. The whole of our life will proceed according to nature if, from the beginning, we curb our appetites and do not destroy by wicked and malicious devices the race of mankind which is born of divine providence. For those women who, to conceal fornication, use destructive drugs, which lead to utter ruin, lose all humanity, together with the fetus. . . . If uprightness should be practised, much more should uprightness be shown toward your wife by avoiding intercourse which is not upright; and let there be trustworthy evidence coming from your home that you deal chastely with your neighbors. For nothing can be deemed upright by her with whom uprightness in those vehement pleasures is not proved by irrefragable evidence, as it were. The love which rushes headlong toward intercourse lasts but a short time and grows old with the body; sometimes it grows old even before the body, since lust becomes torpid when whorish lusts have vitiated the temperance of marriage. For the hearts of lovers are winged, and the impulses of love are often extinguished in repentance, and love often turns to hate when satiety has felt reproof.[1]

T. SLATER, S.J.

St. Beuno's College, Wales.

[1] Pædagogus, ii. 10.

Analecta.

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

Litterae Apostolicae.

LATIS NOVIS LEGIBUS DE PONTIFICIO INSTITUTO BIBLICO, DECERNITUR QUAE INTERCEDERE DEBEANT RATIONES TUM EIDEM INSTITUTO, TUM PONTIFICIO CONSILIO VULGATAE RESTITUENDAE, CUM SUPREMO PONTIFICIO CONSILIO REI BIBLICAE PROVEHENDAE.

Benedictus PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Cum Biblia Sacra a rationalistis, qui quidem nullam Dei nec revelationem nec inspirationem ponunt, sic recentiore memoria tractarentur, quasi a solis hominum ingeniis profecta essent, eorumque commenta, omni apparatu eruditionis instructa, latius in dies, cum gravissima imperitorum offensione, serperent, Apostolici officii conscientia permotus, Decessor Noster Leo XIII, ut huic tantae tamque perniciosae temeritati occurreret, Litteris Encyclicis *Providentissimus Deus*, die XVIII mensis novembris an. MDCCCXCIII datis, certa quaedam posuit illustravitque principia, quibus parere omnes oporteret, quicumque se ad studium et interpretationem divinarum Litterarum contulissent. Eiusmodi autem incommodis cotidie ingravescentibus, idem Pontifex, ne ulli providentiae modo pepercisse videretur, Litteris

Apostolicis *Vigilantiae studiique memores*, die XXX mensis octobris an. MDCCCCII datis, Consilium seu *Commissionem*, quam vocant, studiis Sacrae Scripturae provehendis instituit, cui universa rei biblicae cura propria esset ac peculiaris. Optimum sane propositum uberrimi, ut exspectare par erat, consecuti sunt laetissimique fructus, cum Cardinales aliique doctissimi viri, in id Consilium adlecti, hoc spatio temporis, plura ediderint, post maturam deliberationem Romanoque Pontifice adprobante, responsa, quibus et quaestiones satis multae, antehac in contrarias partes agitatae, sunt, opportune diremptae, et leges studiis catholicorum doctorum biblicis dirigendis sapienter utiliterque praefinitae.

Neque vero actuosa Pontificii Consilii opera hos intra fines constitit. Anno enim MDCCCCVII, auctore atque auspice fel. rec. Decessore Nostro Pio X, decrevit, ut Bibliorum a S. Hieronymo in latinum facta conversio, quae *Vulgatae* nomen invenit, antiquis praesertim codicibus inspectis, ad pristinam lectionem restitueretur. Quod quidem munus, laboriosum sane ac perarduum, sodalibus Benedictinis auspicato delatum est, qui, nullo paleographiae cognatarumque doctrinarum neglecto praesidio, remotisque omnibus, quae in re tam gravi necessario obstarent, impedimentis, admirabili, qua solent, et sollertia et constantia, inceptum, acatholicis ipsis probatissimum, persequuntur.

Haud ita multo post, cum eidem Pontifici visum esset expeditiorem clericis aperire viam, ut omnibus saepti munimentis propugnationem pro Scriptura Sacra susciperent, suasore eodem Pontificio Consilio, Litteris Apostolicis *Vinea electa*, datis die VII mensis maii an. MDCCCCIX, Institutum Biblicum in hac alma Urbe condidit, illudque non modo apparatissimis aedibus bibliothecaque singulari et fere unica instruxit, sed locupletavit etiam eo omni eruditionis biblicae instrumento, quod ad pleniorem intelligentiam validioremque Librorum Sacrorum tuitionem quam maxime conferret. Societatis Iesu sodalibus, praeclare de disciplinis sacris deque clericorum institutione meritis, mandavit, Instituto praeessent, docerent; qui Pontificis bonorumque omnium ita exspectationem explevere, ut iam, haud longo intervallo, complures eosque peritissimos in Ecclesiae campum horum studiorum cultores dimiserint.

Haec omnia diligenter animo reputantibus, occurrit Nobis cogitatio, quo pacto possemus instituta tanti ponderis sic complere ac perficere, ut parta antehac Ecclesiae Dei magno numero commoda uberiorum accessione utilitatum cumularentur: quod si fecissemus, videbamur rem certe facturi a mente proximi Decessoris Nostri minime alienam, quandoquidem constat, plura hac in re Pontificem statuisse ea lege, ut, quemadmodum vel condicio temporum vel rerum usus et experientia postulasset, ita corrigerentur, perficerentur. Deliberatum igitur Nobis est, nonnulla constituere, quibus tum Instituti in primis Biblici efficientiam virtutemque, quantum fieri potest, augeamus, tum etiam mutuas rationes et necessitudines moderemur, quae et eidem Instituto et Pontificio Consilio Vulgatae restituendae praeposito cum supremo Nostro de universa re biblica Consilio intercedant oportet.

Itaque, salvis iis omnibus, quae, antea quoquo modo sancita, ab hisce Litteris Nostris minime discrepent, haec Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra edicimus ac decernimus quae sequuntur:

I. Ad Scripturae Sacrae studia in Instituto Biblico ne admittantur, nisi qui ordinarium studiorum philosophiae et theologiae cursum confecerint.

II. Studiorum biblicorum curriculum tribus ibidem annis absolvatur, servata tradendarum disciplinarum ratione, quae, Nostro rei biblicae provehendae Consilio probata, ad hunc diem viguit; unoquoque autem exeunte anno, fiat, uti assolet, doctrinae experimentum.

III. Iis penitus abrogatis, quae continentur tum Litteris Apostolicis *Iucunda sane* die XXII mensis martii an. MDCCCCXI et *Ad Pontificium Institutum Biblicum* die II mensis iunii an. MDCCCCXII datis, tum aliis Litteris, quae huic voluntatis Nostrae significationi haud congruant, Instituto Biblico largimur, ut alumnis, qui facto periculo probati sint, post primum annum det litteras testimoniales legitimi adscensus, post alterum vero, academicum conferat baccalaureatus gradum.

IV. Litteris Apostolicis *Scripturae Sanctae*, die XXIII mensis februarii an. MDCCCCIV datis, derogantes, Instituto Biblico concedimus, ut discipulis, qui integrum ibidem studiorum curriculum confecerint, tentata eorum doctrina eademque probata, academicum in Sacra Scriptura prolytatus gradum, nomine tamen Pontificii Consilii Biblici, decernat.

V. Testimoniales Litterae et diplomata academicorum graduum, de quibus nn. III et IV sermo est, in eam sententiam edantur, quam Pontificium Consilium Biblicum antea probaverit.

VI. Iudiciis, quibus in Instituto Biblico candidatorum ad prolytatum doctrina explorabitur, unus aliquis e consultoribus Pontificii Consilii Biblici, quem Cardinales e Consilio eodem delegerint, continenter intersit et suffragium ferat, ut ceteri.

VII. Quemvis academicum in Sacra Scriptura gradum conferri ne liceat nisi iis, quos legitime constet laurea sacrae theologiae potitos esse in aliquo athenaeo ab Apostolica Sede adprobato. Si quis autem eam lauream vel alium similem titulum sit alibi consecutus, res ad Pontificium Consilium Biblicum iudicanda deferatur.

VIII. Ius laureae in Sacra Scriptura impertiendae uni esto Supremo Nostro rei biblicae provehendae Consilio, quod item perget ad experimentum admittere eos ad prolytatum candidatos, qui Sacrae Scripturae studiis extra Institutum Biblicum vacaverint.

IX. Nemini liceat suam periclitari doctrinam, laureae in Scriptura Sacra potiundae causa, nisi saltem biennio ante Prolyta renuntiatus sit, simulque vel rem biblicam docuerit vel aliquam de eadem elucubrationem ediderit.

X. Professores ordinarii Sacrae Scripturae in Instituto Biblico tradendae a Praeposito Generali Societatis Iesu, uti antehac, eligantur; accedat tamen Pontificii Consilii assensus.

XI. Tum Pontificium Consilium Vulgatae restituendae, tum Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, quotannis, ad supremum Nostrum rei biblicae provehendae Consilium de opera et condicione sua, deque rebus maioris momenti universis, scripto plene absoluteque referant.

Quae vero in hac causa statuere ac decernere visum est, ea omnia et singula, uti statuta et decreta sunt, ita rata et firma esse ac manere volumus et iubemus: contrariis non obstantibus quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XV mensis augusti anno MDCCCCXVI, Pontificatus Nostri secundo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

L. * S.

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

I.

Instructio super Casuum Conscientiae Reservationibus.

Cum experientia comprobatum sit casuum, quos vocant, conscientiae reservationes, si debitam mensuram et modum excedant, in animarum perniciem potiusquam in earum utilitatem vergere posse; Suprema haec Sacra Congregatio Sancti Officii, praecedentibus ad rem dispositionibus novas, pro opportunitate temporum, superaddens, de expresso mandato Ssmi D. N. Benedicti divina providentia PP. XV, haec cum omnibus et singulis Rmis locorum Ordinariis *decretorie* omnino ac *praeceptive* communicanda statuit:

1. Meminerint ante omnia Rmi Ordinarii casuum conscientiae reservationes *ad destructionem munitionum*, iuxta dictum Apostoli (2 *Cor.*, x, 4), ad removenda scilicet obstacula quae saluti animarum *non communi* impedimento sunt, esse dirigendas; ideoque, generatim loquendo, extraordinario huic remedio manus ne velint apponere nisi, re in synodo dioecesana discussa, vel, extra synodum, auditis Capitulo Cathedrali et aliquot ex probatioribus ac prudentioribus suae dioecesis animarum curatoribus, de vera reservationis necessitate aut utilitate in Domino convincantur.

2. Utcumque, casus reservandi sint *pauci* omnino, *tres* vel, ad summum, *quatuor*, atque ex gravioribus tantum et atrocioribus criminibus *specifice* determinandis; ipsa vero reservatio non ultra in vigore maneat quam necesse sit ad publicum aliquod inolitum vitium extirpandum aut collapsam forte christianam disciplinam instaurandam.

3. Reservationi, generatim, ne submittantur sive *peccata mere interna*, quippe quae, ut docet Benedictus XIV (*De syn. dioec.*, V, 5, 5), *non est in praxi receptum ut unquam reserventur*, propter animarum periculum; sive quae ex *humana fragilitate* derivantia aliam non habeant specialem sibi coniunctam malitiam, propter humanam infirmitatem.

4. Prorsus autem ab iis peccatis sibi reservandis Ordinarii abstineant, quae iam sint Sedi Apostolicae reservata, ne scilicet absque necessitate multiplicentur leges; et, regulariter, ab iis quoque quibus censura, etsi nemini reservata, a iure imposita sit; hoc enim expresse prohibet vetus Instructio S. Congrega-

tionis Episcoporum et Regularium diei 26 novembris 1602, quae ita se habet: "Praesertim vero haec monenda censet Sacra Congregatio, ut videant ipsi Ordinarii ne illos casus promiscue reservent quibus adnexa est excommunicatio maior a iure imposita, cuius absolutio nemini reservata sit, nisi forte propter frequens scandalum aut aliam necessariam causam aliqui huiusmodi casus nominatim reservandi viderentur".

5. Cauti insuper omnino sint et quam maxime parci quod ad poenales sanctiones, excommunicationes praesertim, quibus forte suas reservationes communire velint; nam, ut sapienter admonet Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus (Sess. 25, *de Ref.*, c. 3): "Quamvis excommunicationis gladius nervus sit ecclesiasticae disciplinae et ad continendos in officio populos valde salutaris; sobrie tamen magnaque circumspectione exercendus est, cum experientia doceat, si temere aut levibus ex rebus incutiatur, magis contemni quam formidari et perniciem potius parere quam salutem".

6. Verumtamen, statutis semel reservationibus quas vere utiles aut necessarias iudicaverint, curent omnino ut ad *certam* fidelium notitiam, quo meliori eis videbitur modo, eaedem deducantur—nam quaenam earum vis si lateant?—easque, quamdiu necessitas aut utilitas perduraverit, firmas teneant, seu facultatem a reservatis absolvendi ne cuivis et passim impertiant. Mens tamen est S. Congregationis ut huiusmodi absolvendi facultas *habitualiter* impertiatur saltem Canonico Poenitentiario, etiam Ecclesiae Collegiatae, et Vicariis Foraneis eorumve vices gerentibus, addita his ultimis, praesertim in locis dioecesis a sede episcopali remotioribus, etiam facultate subdelegandi *toties quoties* confessarios sui districtus, si et quando pro urgentiori aliquo determinato casu ad eos recurrant.

7. Ad evitanda demum gravia inconvenientia quae ex reservationibus utilibus quoque ac necessariis in peculiaribus quibusdam rerum adiunctis facile oriri possent, eadem S. Congregatio, nomine et auctoritate Sanctissimi, sequentia decernit:

(*a*) Quaevis Ordinariorum reservatio *ipso iure* cessat sive cum aegrotis qui domo excedere non valent, confiteri cupientibus; sive cum sponsis confitentibus matrimonii ineundi causa; sive tandem quoties, prudenti confessarii iudicio, absolvendi facultas a legitimo Superiore peti nequeat absque gravi

poenitentis incommodo aut sine periculo violationis sigilli sacramentalis.

(*b*) Cessat pariter reservatio si, petita pro aliquo determinato casu a legitimo Superiore absolvendi facultate, haec forte denegata fuerit: cessat tamen pro ea vice tantum.

(*c*) Toto tempore ad praeceptum paschale adimplendum utili, a casibus quos quomodolibet sibi Ordinarii reservaverint, absolvere possunt, absque alius facultatis ope, parochi quive parochorum nomine in iure censentur.

(*d*) Quo tempore Sacras Missiones ad aliquem populum haberi contingat, eadem absolvendi facultate gaudent singuli Missionarii.

(*e*) Postremo, a peccatis in aliqua dioecesi reservatis absolvi possunt poenitentes in alia dioecesi, ubi reservata non sunt, a quovis confessario sive saeculari sive regulari, etiamsi praecise ad absolutionem obtinendam eo accesserint.

8. Sed, denique, studeant potissimum Ordinarii doctos, pios ac prudentes confessarios in tota dioecesi efformare, eisque opportuniora ad inolita vitia convellenda remedia suggerant quae ipsimet, si poenitentes ad se remitterentur, adhibituri forent. Quo, dum et confessariis et poenitentibus inevitabiles reservationum molestias vitabunt, optatum effectum suavius simul ac certius, Deo adiuvante, consequi poterunt. Interim vero casuum reservatorum, si qui in propria dioecesi constituti sint, disciplinam ad haec praescripta quamprimum reducere, servato modo art. 1° statuto, et haec omnia suos confessarios apprime edoceri satagant.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 13 iulii 1916.

R. Card. Merry del Val, *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

II.

De Adsistentia Passiva Parochorum in Matrimoniis mixtis.

Feria IV die 2 augusti 1916.

Cum dubia varia orta fuerint circa decretum latum ab hac Suprema Congregatione S. Officii die 21 maii 1912 circa adsistentiam passivam Parochorum in celebratione matrimonii mixti, haec eadem S. Congregatio sui muneris esse duxit de-

clarare praefatam adsistentiam passivam tolerari solummodo in illis regionibus, quibus ante Decretum *Ne temere* concessiones speciales factae ac instructiones datae fuerant a S. Sede, et tantum in casibus et sub conditionibus ibidem expressis, atque proinde matrimonia extra praedictas regiones sic contracta (idest cum adsistentia Parochi passiva) esse non tantum illicita, sed etiam omnino invalida.

Et feria V, die 3 eiusdem mensis, SSmus D. N. Benedictus divina providentia PP. XV, in solita audientia R. P. D. Adsessori huius Supremae Congregationis S. Officii impertita, relatam sibi suprascriptam declarationem benigne adprobare ac suprema sua auctoritate in omnibus ratam habere dignatus est.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 5 augusti 1916.

ALOISIUS CASTELLANO, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

III.

DECRETUM QUO PLURA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA CIRCA INDULGENTIAS A TERTIARIIS SAECULARIBUS ORDINIS MINORUM LUCRANDAS.

Procurator generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Supremae Sacrae Congregationi Sancti Offici sequentia humiliter exposuit:

Recolendae memoriae Pius Papa X, per Breve *Sodalium e Tertio Ordine*, datum die 5 maii 1909, in perpetuum concessit: " Ut quibus pontificalis indulgentiae donis fruuntur, quosque de bonis operibus spirituales fructus percipiunt familiae seraphicae primi et alterius Ordinis, ea omnia Tertiarii Franciscales quotquot sunt utriusque sexus et cuiusvis Instituti, vitae mortisque tempore participent ". Insuper idem Pontifex oblatis sibi in eam rem precibus annuens, propriaque manu supplici libello subscribens, die 17 eiusdem mensis et anni in perpetuum pariter concessit: " Quatenus laudata Indulgentiarum et spiritualium fructuum communicatione perfrui in perpetuum possint quotquot sub patriarchae seraphici sancti Francisci vexillo militant, ad quemcumque Ordinem vel Ordinum familiam pertineant ".

Iam vero ex hac indulta communicatione Indulgentiarum, non pauca dubia suborta sunt, quoad eiusdem interpretationem

et applicationem ad casus particulares. Quapropter, ut secure procedatur in re tanti momenti, orator suppliciter rogavit ut authentice solverentur haec dubia:

I. Utrum vi praedictae communicationis, ecclesiae seu publica oratoria quae sint propria Tertii Ordinis Saecularis Franciscalis, gaudeant Indulgentiis concessis cuilibet ecclesiae et oratorio publico primi et secundi Ordinis nec non Tertii Ordinis Regularis favore omnium fidelium, qui ea loca certis diebus visitaverint?

II. Utrum fideles adscripti Tertio Ordini S. Francisci lucrari possint Indulgentias directe concessas ecclesiis seu oratoriis primi, secundi et tertii Ordinis Regularis, si loco ipsorum visitent ecclesiam seu capellam in qua sedes Sodalitii est constituta, quamvis haec ecclesia seu capella ad Tertium Ordinem proprie non pertineat? Et, si affirmative,

III. An vi indultae communicationis, Tertiarii lucrari valeant Indulgentiam plenariam concessam visitantibus ecclesias primi Ordinis in Commemoratione omnium Fratrum defunctorum, tum in die quo eadem Commemoratio celebratur apud Familiam sub cuius obedientia vivunt, tum etiam in die quo apud alias Familias celebratur, idest pluries per annum?

IV. Utrum Indulta pro consequendis Indulgentiis favore Tertiariorum infirmorum, impeditorum, etc., de quibus agitur cap. V Summarii approbati a Sacra Congregatione Indulgentiarum die 11 septembris 1901, respiciant dumtaxat Indulgentias Tertio Ordini Saeculari directe concessas, an etiam communicatas ex primo, secundo ac tertio Ordine Regulari?

V. An haec communicatio a Pio X indulta valeat tam pro Indulgentiis ad ea usque tempora concessis quam pro illis quae in posterum Ordini Franciscali concedentur?

Et Emi Domini Cardinales Generales Inquisitores, feria IV, die 7 iunii 1916, in ordinario coetu coadunati, respondendum censuerunt:

Ad I et II. *Affirmative.*

Ad III. *Negative*, sed semel tantum in anno.

Ad IV. *Negative* ad primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad V. *Affirmative.*

Facta autem, feria V subsequenti, die 8, iisdem mense et anno, relatione Ssmo D. N. D. Benedicto div. prov. Papae

XV, per R. P. D. Adsessorem, Sanctitas Sua sententiam Emorum Patrum benigne ratam habuit et confirmavit.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. Card. Merry del Val, *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

✠ Donatus, Archiep. Ephesin., *Adsessor.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

Westmonasteriensis et Nortantoniensis.

dismembrationis et unionis.

Decreto huius S. Consistorialis Congregationis diei 25 iulii 1916, SSmus Dominus Noster Benedictus PP. XV statuit ut ea pars territorii vulgo *Royston*, quae nonnullos ante annos, civilis auctoritatis iussu, a comitatu *Cambridgeshire*, ad dioecesim Nortantoniensem pertinente, disiuncta fuerat et comitatui *Hertfordshire* dioecesi Westmonasteriensi proprio adiuncta, a dioecesi Nortantoniensi avulsa, dioecesi Westmonasteriensi adscriberetur, ut fines ecclesiastici cum civilibus adaequarentur.

ROMAN CURIA.

Pontifical Appointments.

27 November, 1915: Monsignor Matthew Brodie, Bishop of Christchurch, New Zealand.

27 April, 1916: Joseph F. Daly, of New York, Commendator of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

28 April: Monsignor Daniel Foley, Bishop of Ballarat, Australia.

1 May: Clarence H. Mackay, of New York, Commendator of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

4 May: The Hon. Victor J. Dowling, of New York, Commendator of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

5 May: John J. Agar and the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran, of New York, Commendator of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

7 May: Michael J. Mulqueen and Miles Tierney, of New York, Commendators of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

8 May: Monsignor William L. Penny and Monsignor James Walsh Power, of New York, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

9 May: Monsignor Edwin M. Sweeney, of New York, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

10 May: Monsignor John P. Chidwick, of New York, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

13 July: Monsignor John Murphy, C.S.Sp., Bishop of Port Louis, Mauritius.

2 August: Monsignor James T. Walsh and Monsignor Michael J. O'Reilly, of Kansas City, Missouri, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

PASTORAL LETTER defining the relations of the Pontifical Biblical Institute and the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Vulgate to the Supreme Pontifical Commission on Bible Studies.

S. CONGREGATION OF HOLY OFFICE: (1) gives instruction on reservations of cases of conscience; (2) solves certain doubts regarding passive assistance of pastors at mixed marriages; (3) publishes a decree deciding several questions regarding the gaining of indulgences by secular tertiaries of the Order of Friars Minor.

S. CONGREGATION OF CONSISTORY by decree withdraws a portion of the Diocese of Northampton and adds it to the Diocese of Westminster.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially recent pontifical appointments.

SPARE TIME OF PRIESTS.

Some years ago I listened with pleasure to an address by a young Bishop, who has since become Cardinal and the Archbishop of Quebec, to his seminarians, on the subject of the use of their time after ordination. The Bishop astonished me by stating that he expected each one of his young priests to spend at least five hours a day in study. As I was then a seminarian myself, anxiously looking forward to the day of ordination as the beginning of a partial relief from study, I must confess that I was amongst those astonished at the Bishop's expectations. He must have read that astonishment on the faces of his audience; for he at once explained that the best sort of rest for a student is *a change of studies.* "When you become tired," he said, "pick up a different kind of book and go to work on that."

The idea of studying five hours a day may not be popular with the average young American priest; but the idea of sys-

tematically utilizing his spare time is one that ought to interest him. Of course, it is a joke to suggest to the average city priest that he has any spare time. He has it, but he really doesn't know it. In fact, all of us have spare time. I asked one of the busiest priests of my acquaintance how he managed to write so much, while, at the same time, he was directing about a dozen important things. He laughed and said that when he had nothing to do he succeeded admirably in doing nothing; but when every minute of his time was taken he always found that he could squeeze in something else and enjoy the process It is a fact that the busy man has made his mind so alert that he can do in half an hour what it would take the lazy man a week to accomplish.

Recently I had the pleasure of meeting, or hearing of, some priests who have reduced to a fine art the utilization of spare time. There are three of them in the diocese of Brooklyn, all being editors; two of them are parish priests; one is a busy assistant. The parish priests are editors, and the assistant conducts a book-review column and supplies pages of other copy besides; yet none of them misses the round of duty, and all are looking hale and hearty. One of the parish priests is the director of a national society, as well as the president of the Board of Education of his town. There is a priest in the diocese of Detroit, pastor of a large German church in the city, who on Christmas Day said two early Masses in his own church, and went forty miles into the country on a trolley and by buggy to say the third Mass in the parish of a country priest who had a little mission where the people needed a sermon in a Slavic tongue. His Christmas work was only a sample, for he had been helping out in the same way, and in the same mission, many times. Detroit has another priest who managed to be mayor of his city in his spare time. Oregon has produced a country pastor who, having not much to do from Monday morning until Saturday night, took to gardening and became a second Burbank. He merely used his spare time to become one of the greatest living authorities on roses. I hope that no one will imagine that the Oregon priest just dropped into his fame. He once tried to utilize his spare time in another way—and failed; but failure did not spoil him; it helped him. There is a priest, again in Detroit, who utilized

his spare time as a country pastor in collecting Indian curiosities. He is now an authority on archeology.

Many things will suggest themselves in this connexion as opportunities for the use of the priests' spare time. One of the most fascinating employments for a great many is writing, and in that regard we are in a happier position than France; because in America we really haven't Catholic books enough, while the clergy of France threaten to inundate their country with them. Of course, every priest hasn't the knack required for the production of books that are worth while; but there are a great many priests who could shine as writers for the Catholic magazines and papers. According to Mr. Baldus, of the literary staff of *Extension Magazine*, there is a dearth of Catholic short-story writers; but there is no dearth of material in clerical life, of the most unusual kind, out of which priests could make admirable short stories. It was the very simplicity of *My New Curate* that made Canon Sheehan a success as a novelist. His previous efforts were much more "learned", but no one wanted to read them. Study of the technique of the short story is more fascinating than the study of machinery. Then, I have for years been publishing articles by missionary priests. To many, these articles are the most interesting part of the publication I edit. Such priests write out of their hearts and draw from their experiences. Almost invariably the work is well done and highly creditable. Catholic papers are hungry for material of this kind; and while they cannot pay much for it, the priest who utilizes his spare time in that way will be gaining what money cannot buy. I particularly recommend attempts at short-story writing, for the short story has an influence at the present time that is nothing short of marvelous. Priests could seize it for the good that they might do.

There is another field for effort in the drama. We have plenty of plays that are bad, but few that are good. Perhaps not one play in a thousand that a priest attempts will be successful. But what of that? If he puts spare time into the preliminary study of the technique of the drama, and reads carefully the successful dramas of the day, he may win success. His parish dramatic club (he could organize one) would give him the opportunity of seeing what his efforts look like on the stage, and the dramatic club could be a good in itself.

For the young priest spare time should be utilized by contracting the habit of *thinking out his own sermons.* I believe that the sermon book has done more harm than good. Few priests with spare time on their hands but can sit down and think out their own plans. I know a priest who carries a note-book every place, on sick-calls, on trips to his missions, on the trains. Always he is watching for suggestive things—facts, figures, thoughts, etc. He told me himself that the woods are literally full of figures and examples; so he loves to walk in the woods and do his thinking there. Father Tabb perfected his poetry amongst the flowers of the garden of St. Charles College. There are probably Lacordaires in the priesthood of the United States who have not yet learned how to cultivate the order that produces logical sermons, the concentration that makes them great, and the habit of observation that makes them beautiful. Even meetings of clerical friends, casual visits of neighbors, need not mean waste of time. Find out what the other fellow knows, direct the conversation into useful channels, and time is gained instead of lost. One never knows when he needs the things that come out in a casual chat. Incidents long forgotten come forth at the opportune hour from the cells of memory, and need only to be dusted off. In this connexion let me suggest that priests are not encouraged to become great preachers, often because they are not invited to deliver great sermons. It is often the occasion that shows up the great preacher; but with us the "occasion" usually calls for at least a bishop. Some bishops are good preachers, but all good preachers are not bishops. Had France acted as we do, there never would have been a Bourdaloue, a Lacordaire, a MacCarthy, or a Felix. Von Ketteler was a big man *before* his consecration.

The country priest in particular has many opportunities for utilizing spare time for the good of his people. I know one priest who became an authority on agriculture. From that he turned to forestry; and then became just as much of an authority on raising fruit. Those who knew him were astonished when he received the degree of Doctor of Forestry from a well-known university, for they had not noticed his growth until he had arrived. A whole section of the country had reason to bless the activity of that man, and are blessing him

to this day. There is a little town in Iowa that has received wonderful benefits from a Methodist minister who, having spare time on his hands, turned it into hard work for his parish by encouraging the establishment of a vocational school. A priest in a country district who has farmers for parishioners could find useful work to do, either in organizing his people into an agricultural society, and becoming an authority himself for them, or enlarging the usefulness of already existing societies by introducing agricultural studies. The good would be a double one in this case; for, in addition to the obvious benefit, is the one of not lesser importance, that of keeping young farmers out of the city. More than one country priest has constituted himself a real-estate agent, and has thus managed not only to keep his young people at home, but to draw others to his parish. It is said that Archbishop Hennessy of Dubuque used to send priests out to cross-roads and let them *find a congregation.* Many of the sturdy Catholic farmers of Iowa to-day are there because their ancestors were attracted to the spot from Ireland by the cross-roads priests of Iowa, who had to " root or die ". I do not know if this Archbishop Hennessy story be true or not; but it might well be true, and I hope it is.

When speaking of the influence of the priest who uses his spare time in actual work for the material benefit of his people, a whole gold mine of opportunities in little things opens up. Farmers' houses are proverbially uncomfortable, and many of them are not altogether too clean. It wouldn't be policy perhaps, on the part of the priest, to call attention to these things; but it would be policy were he to familiarize himself with plans for model country homes and show them to his people, explaining how easy it is to have them at a small expenditure over and above what one pays for a plain house. A porch and a sun-parlor attached to a farm-house make all the difference in the world, and most farmers could build porches and sun-parlors themselves. The average farmer, when he sees such " luxuries ", imagines that they cost more than they actually do. A priest who started seriously to work to improve the houses of his people, in a judicious way, would be doing a great deal to keep the children of the farmer happy and contented; which goes very far toward *holding on to a*

country parish, instead of letting it drift to the city. I know a priest in Mexico who built three hundred model homes for his working people. He was so influential with them that the revolutionists wanted to shoot him on sight. They never saw him, for he heard of their benevolent intentions in time. Along the same line comes the idea of improving interiors. A few cents nowadays will buy a really artistic sepia reproduction of an old master, which is an education almost in itself. When a few of them go into country homes, the worthless chromoes that have been foisted on Catholics in this country by the church-goods houses of the last generation will go where they belong—into the kitchen stove. The average farmer does not realize that for twenty-five cents he can put a picture on his wall that is a decoration itself alone.

The really successful priest, city or country, is the one who not only does his ordinary work well, but who has been successful in picking out an extra work that he can do just as well, or even a little better. The priest who stands out in a diocese usually stands out by works of supererogation. The priest who is always lonesome, and feels that, in desperation, he has to accept every invitation as an excuse to get away, ought to begin to examine his conscience. Unrest is not a bad thing if it spurs a man on to finding his amusement by changing his work. I am convinced that there are hundreds of good preachers who have never yet been discovered in the Church of the United States, because they have not tried to discover themselves. There are hundreds of good writers who are hiding their lights under a bushel of false modesty, not knowing that the light is worth while. Every priest is somewhat of an idealist and somewhat of a lover of beauty; therefore we have hundreds of undiscovered poets. It would be a great thing to have a literary bureau at the Catholic University to which young (and old) priests could send MSS for honest and free criticism; and it would help the University, too. The most useful teacher is the teacher who makes beginnings, and there are thousands of vocations that go to waste because priests have not had the courage to hunt for them and to foster them. There are many unwritten chapters of American Church history; unwritten only because some one did not utilize his spare time in digging up the facts and writing them.

The habit of utilizing spare time, universally applied by young American priests, would give us many happy surprises in the future.

It is not getting too far from the main idea of this article to point out that bishops, as well as priests, could learn a lot from the business man at the head of a great corporation. Such a man is constantly on the watch for undiscovered genius in his organization; and when the genius comes to light, it is given a chance, not for its own good, but for the good of the concern. I firmly believe that ecclesiastical superiors do not study their individual priests enough. The consequence is that, too often, positions that require executive ability, or genius in one form or another, are filled with an eye only to age, personal appearance, or the convenience of the moment. I have known of more than one forty-horsepower priest in a five-horsepower parish, merely because it did not seem convenient to put him where he could do bigger and greater work. I have known priests to eat their hearts out because they felt they were wasting their time at something they could do only indifferently well; while, as a matter of fact, these very men were sadly needed in the direction of institutions of the general work of the diocese. Of course, it will be urged that this is true in every walk of life. But it is not true in business life. When the rewards to be gained are only in money dividends, ability is recognized and utilized. Why shouldn't it be so when the dividends are to be realized in greater than money—immortal souls?

Of this thing I am convinced: the secret of material, and of much spiritual progress in the Church, will be found when superiors systematically search out the men who utilize their spare time; and then see that their talents are, later on, directed into channels that are profitable and useful to the diocese and to souls. Can't we learn a lesson from the "mammon of iniquity"; or must we *always* allow the "children of darkness" to be "wiser in their generation"?

FRANCIS C. KELLEY.

Chicago, Illinois.

SPONSORS AT BAPTISM.

Qu. It is a custom among some nationalities to have the same sponsor at baptism for all the children of one family, even when the family is blest with ten or twelve children. Recently, a neighboring priest refused to admit the same sponsors for the third child in a family, stating that it was obligatory on the parents to have different sponsors for each child. Was he right in his contention?

Resp. The prescriptions in regard to sponsors or "patrini" are contained in the Roman Ritual (Tit. II, Cap. 1, Nos. 22-26), and are explained at length by moral theologians, for example, by Lehmkuhl (Vol. II, Nos. 97 ff.). Heretics, excommunicated persons, persons under interdict, and others are nominally excluded. Religious of both sexes are not, as a rule, permitted to assume the office of sponsor. Nowhere is it expressly forbidden that one individual may be sponsor for several persons of the same or of different families. However, it is well understood that, if need be, the sponsor is obliged to see to the education of his spiritual child, in case it is neglected by those on whom the obligation primarily rests. From the point of view of this obligation it may be inadvisable that one person should "stand for" all the children of a numerous family, and perhaps the pastor who ruled, as our correspondent narrates, in a particular instance may have been justified by this consideration. There is also the consideration of the spiritual relationship, although it is not clear how this might influence the pastor's decision.

SECULARIZED RELIGIOUS AND DIOCESAN OFFICES.

Qu. Does the decree of Pius X forbid ex-religious priests who have been dispensed from simple vows as well as those who had solemn vows, to hold office in a bishop's curia? Could a priest who has been dispensed from simple vows, after he has been duly incardinated in a diocese, hold office as dean or diocesan consultor?

Resp. The decree in question is, apparently, that of the Congregation of Religious, dated 15 June, 1909. It mentions both those who have professed solemn vows in a religious order and those who have been dispensed from perpetual vows in any religious institute. It rules that neither can hold an

office in the diocesan curia except by dispensation. The dispensation is reserved to the Apostolic See.

QUESTION OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

Qu. A venerable, learned priest, whose orthodoxy has never been under the shadow of suspicion, has vainly endeavored to convince me that the following is Catholic doctrine: The Pope cannot define a doctrine of faith and morals without consulting or communicating with the body of bishops of the Church. Should he define a doctrine without consulting them, he would be regarded as acting as an individual, not officially, even though he was convinced that he was acting as head of the Church. Please give your opinion.

AN OBSTINATE JUNIOR.

Resp. Our opinion, *salva reverentia*, is that the "Obstinate Junior" is right. The decree of the Vatican Council defining the dogma of Papal Infallibility reads: "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when, in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church—is, by reason of the Divine assistance promised to him in Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals; and consequently (that) such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable *ex sese*, and not by reason of the Church's consent". It is not a question whether the Roman Pontiff does consult the bishops of the Church, or should consult them, but whether, if he did not consult them, his definition may be *ex cathedra* and infallible. The question is theoretical, and, as has been just said, covers two points. The first is the *ex cathedra* character of the definition. The decree quoted explains in the clause between punctuation dashes what is meant by *ex cathedra*, and therein there is no mention of consulting the bishops of the Church. The second is the question of force or value of the definition, namely, infallibility, and this is expressly covered by the words *ex sese, and not by reason of the Church's consent.* In a word, the previous consultation of the episcopate of the Church is not in itself an indication that the Pope intends to speak *ex cathedra*, while

there are many ways in which the Pope may indicate such an intention.

If the Obstinate Junior finds it needful to cite authorities, he will have no difficulty in quoting such passages as the following. Perrone, *De Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate*, p. 129, writes, in answer to the objection that the definition of papal infallibility has rendered ecumenical councils unnecessary: "Accedit etiam quod, cum Romani Pontificis infallibilitas non sit per modum inspirationis ac revelationis sed per modum assistentiae, quae media etiam humana non excludit, quandoquidem erit non modo utile sed etiam necessarium . . . adhibere oecumenicum concilium". And Palmieri, *De Romano Pontifice* (p. 598) says: "Unde, cum certo constat prolatam esse definitionem ex cathedra, perperam quaestio institueretur, an Pontifex mediis sit usus, et quibus; etsi, enim, non usus esset (quod, quidem, supponi non debet) cum Pontifex tamen ad actum definitionis venit, Deus certe ita assistit ut errorem prohibeat".

THE ORDO IN A HOSPITAL CHAPEL.

Qu. What Missal and Ordo must we use in the chapel of our hospital? Our hospital is in charge of Sisters belonging to an Institute with "vota simplicia" of the Third Order of St. Francis.

Visiting Franciscan Fathers claim that they can say Mass using their own Ordo and Missal in the hospital chapel, namely, "Missale Romano-Seraphicum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum". They say that a special privilege has been granted to them, because the Sisters of this community are affiliated with their Order, and therefore the hospital chapel becomes "ecclesia propria Ordinis Fratrum Minorum".

I claim the contrary. First, because our chapel is an "Oratorium semipublicum" and under the jurisdiction of the Ordinary, consequently for the Franciscans "ecclesia aliena" and not "propria"; and secondly, because of the following decree of the Congregation of Rites: "Quoad Missae celebrationem ubi unus tantum sacerdos addictus sit oratoriis competenti auctoritate erectis in hospitalibus ac domibus quarumque piarum communitatum, hic si sit saecularis, tenetur sequi calendarium dioecesis in qua exstat oratorium; et si regularis, calendarium ordinis quatenus proprio gaudeat relinquere; et si quando celebrant extranei, hi debent se conformare calendario sacerdotis ejusmodi oratoriis addicti, dummodo oratoria illa habenda sint ut publica vel semi-publica". S. R. C. in una Ord. Min. Cap. S. Francisci, 27 Jun. 1896 ad 17. (No. 3919).

Resp. The priests of the Order of Friars Minor as well as any other priest, regular or secular, can say Holy Mass according to the Franciscan missal in the chapels and churches of the Sisters in question. This is evident from a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, 15 April, 1904.[1] The Procurator General of the Order of Friars Minor referred this question to the said S. Congregation in the following terms: "Whether the faculty of using in their churches and chapels the Roman-Seraphic calendar granted by Bull of Pope Pius VI, *Religiosos Ordines*, 6 September, 1785, to the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis and to all other Sisters who either in their origin or in the course of time have any connexion with the Order of Friars Minor, applies not only to the Sisterhoods who say the same divine office as the priests but also to those who only say the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin or other prayers." The S. Congregation answered that the privilege applies to all these Sisterhoods.

The correspondent's first reason to the contrary would be justified if the Sisters did not have the privilege for their oratories and churches, since the general rule is that in churches and public and semi-public chapels all priests, regular and secular, must conform to the ordo of the diocese where they say Holy Mass. In private oratories, however, each priest must follow his own Ordo. The above-quoted decree deals precisely with public and semi-public places of worship and concedes a privilege which is, of course, an exception to the common law. For this reason the Franciscan priests, and for that matter any priest, can claim the right to say Holy Mass according to the Franciscan missal, not because it is a Franciscan church.

The decree of 27 June, 1896, ad 17, is not to the point. This decree refutes the mistaken idea that a chapel or church is said to be an order chapel by the very fact of a regular priest being resident chaplain in an institution having a church or chapel; while in fact it remains a secular chapel over which the order has no jurisdiction. Only when perpetual or at least indefinite charge of a church or chapel has been granted by the bishop to a community of regulars, not to an individual

[1] *Acta Minorum*, Vol. 23 (1904), p. 194. *Decr. auth. S. C. R.*, Vol. VI, p. 64 (No. 4132).

regular priest, does the church or chapel become a church of the order, so that the priests have a right to use there the Franciscan missal. It may be safely asserted that the decree of 1904 is sufficiently clear; for when the decree says that the Franciscan Sisterhoods, or rather all religious communities having any connexion with the Friars Minor, whether Sisterhoods or Brotherhoods, can conform themselves to the Friars in the use of the breviary, diurnal, martyrology, and *missal*, it evidently means that any priest saying Holy Mass in their churches and chapels can use the Franciscan missal; for the Sisters and Brothers cannot make use of the missal.

If there were any doubt at all on account of the decree of 1896, this doubt would disappear by reason of the later decree of 1904, because according to commonly accepted rules of canon law later decrees contrary to earlier ones abrogate the older regulations.

The following conclusions may be of practical value, as there are so many Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods of St. Francis in the United States who participate in the above-mentioned privilege:

1. All Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, as also other religious communities who, though not Franciscan, have either in the beginning of their religious congregation or in the course of time some connexion with the Order of the Friars Minor, can have Holy Mass said in their churches and chapels according to the Franciscan missal.

2. While the priests are allowed to say Holy Mass according to the Franciscan missal, they are not obliged to do so, but may follow the diocesan ordo. But neither the bishop of the diocese nor the chaplain has a right to forbid the use of the Franciscan missal, because it is a privilege granted by the highest authority of the Church and, therefore, can not be taken away or interfered with by an inferior authority. In churches of orders of men and women of solemn vows, all priests, both secular and regular, desiring to say Holy Mass must follow the missal of the respective Order.[2]

[2] *Decr. auth. S. R. C.*, Nos. 4051 and 4150.

3. In churches and chapels of Sisters and Brothers who do not enjoy this privilege the priests saying Holy Mass there must follow the diocesan ordo. Even though a priest of some order is stationed as chaplain in an institution in charge of religious who do not have the privilege of the Franciscan Sisterhoods, the Holy Masses said in the principal chapel of such an institution must be said according to the ordo of the diocese.

4. In a private chapel in the houses of families having by Apostolic privilege a right to a private chapel, or in the private chapel of an institution which has both a public chapel and a private one, all priests must say Holy Mass according to their own ordo.[3]

PERMISSION FOR MILITARY MASS.

Qu. Some time ago a committee of laymen invited some priests to celebrate a solemn field Mass for the soldiers in training in a certain parish. The priest in the parish was not consulted, nor did he take part in the ceremonies. I would like to know whether the priest who celebrated the Mass could do so without consulting the pastor of the locality, even though he had the permission of the bishop or the vicar-general.

Resp. Not even the bishop or the vicar-general has the power to grant permission for the habitual celebration of Mass elsewhere than in churches, chapels, oratories, etc. They may, however, grant permission that Mass be celebrated *per modum actus* in a "profane" place, when there is a grave reason for so doing. Theologians add that, when the bishop cannot be consulted—as, for instance, when the church building has suddenly been unroofed by a storm, or when a body of soldiers suddenly comes into the neighborhood and there is no time to apply for permission—the permission may be presumed. Nowhere is there question of the rights of the pastor in the matter, although, of course, common courtesy and the amenities of life demand that he be informed. In the case before us the strict requirements of the law were observed, but not, apparently, the requirements of clerical courtesy.

[3] *Decr. auth. S. R. C.*, No. 4248.

THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE AUTOMOBILE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

I confess, Reverend Sir, to what Sir Thomas Browne calls a temperamental predisposition against controversy of any kind. The good-natured author of *Religio Medici* seems to state my case when he writes: "I could never divide myself from any man upon the difference of an opinion or be angry with his judgment for not agreeing with me in that from which, perhaps, within a few days I should dissent myself." I condemn, therefore, neither the "Removable Rector" who in your September number arraigns the automobile, nor the "Country Curate" who, in the October number, comes forward in defence of the "machine". My task, for many years, has been to teach the young clerical mind to make distinctions, and by means of distinctions to *determine*, as the logicians are wont to phrase it, the matter under discussion. The other day I happened in on a gathering of my former students who were in the midst of a disputation, not scholastic in form by any means, nor scholastic in matter either. The subject was "The Priest and the Automobile". As I had missed the REVIEW during my annual sojourn in the wilds, I was obliged to ask a few questions, but was soon, as one of my informants expressed it, "put wise" to the terms of the debate, and was then appealed to for "a distinction". Confidentially, dear Mr. Editor, I don't think my listeners were quite serious in the appeal, nor in their recommendation, which followed, to give your readers the benefit of the distinction I made; nevertheless, it is hereby offered for what it is worth.

Abusus rei rei usum non tollit was a sound principle of Roman law. The automobile has its uses, which are excellent; it has its abuses, which—I use the word in its milder Latin sense—are damnable. Unquestionably, the automobile saves time; it enables the priest, in city and especially in country parishes, to get around among his people; it makes it possible for him to arrive in time when the sick-call is urgent; it affords him a legitimate recreation. On the other hand, it may be abused, as when, to quote the "Removable Rector", the priest, "wearing no collar at all, with shirt sleeves rolled up, annihilates space"; or when he uses it, not to get around in his parish,

but to get out of it; or when he indulges in joy-riding or is accompanied by persons of the devout female sex.

The distinction is trite. But is it not adequate? My young friends affected to believe that it is. And now for the *determination* of the question. Everything that God has made or man has invented is subject to use and abuse. Nothing is so good that it may not be perverted to unworthy purposes. The Grace of God itself may, according to a long-accepted phrase, be abused. And nothing is so irretrievably bad that it may not be reformed, or at least furnish occasion for good, according to the formula, "Diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum". I like to believe that out of every form of depravity comes material for the greater sanctity of someone. Use and abuse, then, seem to be, from the spiritual point of view, the light and shade in which anything may be viewed. As I said in the beginning, I cannot be angry with the judgment of anyone; yet, I pity him who sees only the shade; I envy him who sees only the light, and I admire most of all him who, with distinguishing mind, can see both light and shade.

By the way, did either the "Removable Rector" or the "Country Curate" advert to the fact that a trite scholastic distinction may apply with unexpected appropriateness to the automobile? For, did not Roger Bacon have the speedster in mind when he foretold, "Possunt currus fieri ut sine animali moveantur, *cum impetu inaestimabili*"? But, lest I wander farther afield, I hasten to sign a name by which, I more than suspect, the writer's identity will be revealed to his former students.

"DISTINGUO."

THE PRIEST AND THE AUTOMOBILE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Although both sides of the question of the attitude of the priest toward the automobile would seem to have been presented by "Removable Rector" and "Country Curate" in your September and October issues, perhaps you will admit that there is room for further comment.

Most of us feel, no doubt, some irritation at having a parishioner criticize the action of the clergy, and it may not argue a very deep reverence for the priestly office in the layman who

does it so freely. But we are no more to expect extraordinary virtue in this respect in a layman than we can assume it in ourselves. We all freely criticize superiors at times; or those of us who don't are the exceptions. The point to be considered is whether there is any truth in the criticism; and whether that truth reveals an abuse and a danger which need to be noted and corrected.

That we priests have a right to recreation, such as the automobile affords; that the automobile serves a useful purpose to the missionary priest; that there are circumstances when a priest must assume an attitude which ordinarily befits only the professional driver—these are things at which no sensible man will cavil.

But that the command of an automobile offers peculiar temptations for joy-riding, speeding, absenteeism from the parish, and other extravagances which were at one time remote from the clerical life, can hardly be questioned. And these things are more objectionable in a priest than in a layman, because priests profess to be more perfect men — the "forma facti gregis ex animo" of St. Paul, a pattern of self-restraint and of every other virtue, so far as in them lies. They are celibates by vow and profession, and that fact makes it unbecoming in them to "tour" about with housekeepers or other women, when it is plainly avoidable. That these things do cause scandal is a fact; and that they need to be checked is the opinion not only of meddlesome laymen, but also of sensible and broad-minded people, including priests, everywhere. There is a middle course; and just now there are flagrant abuses which bid us remember the fact. TUTO.

THE PORTIUNCULA INDULGENCE.

Qu. In the September number of the REVIEW, I find the document in which the Holy Father extends the privilege of the Portiuncula, and on page 280 of that number your comment that "Benedict XV extends the Portiuncula Indulgence (on the occasion of the seventh centenary of its first institution) to all who visit the Portiuncula Church at Assisi between 1 August, 1916 and 2 August, 1917". Your opinion, I must say, is held by many others who, like you, are worthy of serious consideration. And I admit that the fact of the document being addressed to the General of the Franciscan Order, as

well as the general tenor of the document itself, seem to indicate that the privilege is extended exclusively to those who visit the Portiuncula Church at Assisi.

Nevertheless, I fail to understand what the Holy Father meant to convey when, after stating the nature of the Portiuncula Indulgence and the great advantages it affords both the living and the dead, he speaks of the fitness of the present extension of the privilege, "Cum haec maximi belli immanitas multitudinem animarum quae igni piaculari addictae sunt, innumerabilibus cotidie funeribus adauget", and then adds "Itaque vehemeter quidem cupimus ut toto orbe Catholico ad sacras Franciscalium aedes vel ad eas quas sacrorum Antistites destinaverint, frequentior solito Christianus populus huius veniae impetrandae causa confluat, sed ibi maxime id fiat ubi primum illa divinitus oblata est." Now I make bold to ask: If only the visitors to the Church in Assisi enjoy the benefit, the advantages to the whole Catholic world would be greatly limited. Owing to the extent of the world-war very few even among the Italians could visit Assisi, fewer still from the countries of the allied nations, and none at all from the countries known as the Central Powers.

Surely, there is nothing to prevent the Holy Father from extending the privilege to all the so-called Portiuncula Churches throughout the world, and, surely, he would not wish to deprive anyone of the benefit who wishes sincerely to share in the treasures of the Church.

Resp. Of course, our correspondent is correct when he affirms that the Holy Father could grant the privilege in question to all the Portiuncula churches. The question is: Has he done so? And, in spite of the principle, "Favores sunt ampliandi", we are compelled to interpret the pontifical letter in the restrictive sense. The extraordinary favor, extending the Portiuncula indulgence throughout the year from August, 1916, to August, 1917, makes it a condition that the requisite visit be paid to the Portiuncula Church in Assisi. This is clear from the statutory portion of the letter, which begins with the words "Quamobrem statuimus". The portion of the document from which our correspondent quotes is introductory and does not decree anything. It advises and urges—the document is dated 29 June—that, *this year*, owing to the conditions brought about by the war, and owing to the occurrence of the seventh centenary of the Portiuncula privilege, the people throughout the Christian world take advantage in greater numbers of this great benefit by visiting the churches

in which this indulgence is to be gained. The reference is to the usual dates, the first and second of August. In addition, the Holy Father goes on to say, it is decreed that during the whole year the indulgence may be gained by visiting the Portiuncula Church at Assisi. There are two distinct references. There is first the reference to the privilege already in use; here the Holy Father advises and urges greater devotion and a wider use ("ut frequenter solito Christianus populus confluat"). There is, secondly, the reference to the new privilege, and that is clearly restricted to the church at Assisi.

SUGAR IN ALTAR WINE.

Qu. A friend of mine makes grape wine which, I believe, would do quite well for altar use. In the process of making it, he tells me, he adds sugar "to preserve the wine from turning into vinegar". I have shown our Archbishop a sample of this altar wine, and he agreed with me that it ought to be quite serviceable as Mass wine. He advised me, however, to write you and ask if there is anything against liturgical prescriptions in the fact that sugar was used in the process of manufacture.

Resp. If we understand our correspondent, the sugar was added "to preserve the wine from turning to vinegar" because, the grape being deficient in sugar, did not produce a wine of sufficient alcoholic percentage. There are liturgical prescriptions to meet such a case. There are, in fact, decisions of the Roman Congregations[1] which forbid the addition of cane sugar, but recommend that instead alcohol distilled from the grape substance may be added in quantity not to exceed twelve per cent. One of the most recent decisions, dated 5 August, 1896, is as follows: "Loco sacchari extracti e canna saccharina . . . addendus potius est spiritus *alcool*, dummodo ex genimine vitis extractus fuerit, et cuius quantitas, addita cum ea quam vinum, de quo agitur, naturaliter continet, haud excedat proportionem duodecim pro centum; huiusmodi vero admixtio fiat quando fermentatio tumultuosa, ut aiunt, defervescere inceperit". The question has frequently been discussed in the REVIEW. In the first volume (1889), pages 258-263, the question of valid and legitimate use of wine to which sugar has been added is treated at length.

[1] S. U. I., 25 June, 1891.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

Christological Theories 18. Harvard Christologies 5.

DR. ROYCE AND THE BELOVED COMMUNITY.

The Mystic Christ of Dr. Hocking,[1] and the Eschatological Christ of Dr. Lake [2] by no means fill up the menu that Harvard electivism profers to the young man who hungers for something highly seasoned in Christology. There is the Beloved Community of Royce—a substitute for the traditional Christ that is not so misty as is the trumpery of Hocking, nor so revolting as is the frumpery of Lake.

It was only last December that the American Philosophical Association celebrated the sixtieth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Royce, then Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, University of Harvard; and devoted two sessions of the society's annual meeting to papers dealing with phases of the professor's philosophy. These papers were later published in *The Philosophical Review*.[3] They constitute an apotheosis of Dr. Royce by friends who little expected he would die in September, 1916.

As he taught in Harvard from 1882 to 1916, we deem it only proper to give the late professor of philosophy a place in our studies of Harvard Christologies.

I. Philosophy of Dr. Royce. The key to the theology, and, consequently, to the Christology of Dr. Royce is his philosophy. What philosophical influences he was conscious of, we know by his autobiographical address, at the Walton Hotel, Philadelphia, 29 December, 1915.[4]

1. *Romantic.* While studying in Germany, Royce was very much under the influence of the Romantic School of Philosophy, and of Schopenhauer—the first to make romanticism fundamental in theology. What did he carry with him from this school? To answer this question, we must outline the romantic tendency.

[1] Cf. "Dr. Hocking's Mysticism", ECCL. REVIEW, April, 1916, pp. 482 ff.

[2] Cf. "A Harvard Christology", ECCL. REVIEW, March, 1916, pp. 348 ff.; "Dr. Lake's Eschatology", ECCL. REVIEW, June, 1916, pp. 728 ff.; "Dr. Lake's Vagaries", ECCL. REVIEW, Oct., 1916, pp. 447 ff.

[3] May, 1916.

[4] Cf. *Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, pp. 507 ff.

The foremost Protestant philosopher, Kant (1724-1804), had set at naught *things in themselves*. They are, but we cannot get at them! Fichte (1762-1814) had put aside even Kant's *things in themselves*. What is the use of them, since we cannot get at them? The only thing we know about them is that we know nothing about them! Hence away with them! And then had arisen the Romantic School, started by a group of young men, all born between 1765 and 1775: the two Schlegels (Augustus and his brother Friedrich, later a Catholic), Tieck, Novalis, the philosopher Schelling, and the theologian Schopenhauer.

This was the process of thought of the Romantic school:

"Kant had cut us off from *things in themselves;* Fichte had showed us that it is the I, the self, that makes the world. Let us accept this lesson. The world is essentially what men of genius make it. Let us be men of genius, and make what we choose. We shall then *be as gods, knowing good and evil.*" [5]

Fichte had made the world to be whatsoever self-consciousness made it; and self-consciousness to be the *Moral Will*—"the will to act dutifully, steadfastly, nobly, divinely". The Romantic School made the world to be whatsoever self-consciousness made it; and self-consciousness to be that of the *true self*. And what is the *true self* of the Romantic School? It is, says Royce:

"The self that men of genius, poets, constructive artists know; hence the real world is such as to satisfy the demands of the man of genius, the artist. Emotion, heart-experience, longings, divinations of the soul, are the best instruments for the philosopher. Dream out your world. It is after all but a dream of the inner life, this vast universe about us. The noblest dreamer will be the man to understand it the best." [6]

This romantic influence Royce thought he later threw off. He did not. He always retained traces of the voluntarism of Schopenhauer; and remained a noble dreamer, despite the shift he made to bring logic to bear upon his idealism. Of logic he had none. Rather his logic was early afflicted with poliomyelitis. It was not even healthy infantile logic; but was paralyzed in its infancy. Witness his *sophistry from error.*

[5] Royce, *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1892), p. 173. We shall shortly refer to this juggling with Genesis and the rest of Scripture.

[6] Op. cit., p. 174.

Howison tells us that Edward Everett Hale brought Royce strongly to his own attention, about 1883, by referring to "this striking young man from California", who showed "that our human ignorance is the positive proof that there is a God—a supreme Omniscient Being"![7] With a brilliant imagination, fine language, and the show of tremendous reasoning power, Royce evolves this argument, his sole contribution to neo-Hegelianism, for more than fifty pages of *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*.[8] All his reasoning comes to this:

Every erroneous judgment presupposes a correlative true judgment. Hence for every error there is a truth. But there is an infinite mass of error about each and every object of knowledge. Therefore there is Infinite Truth about each and every object of knowledge. Hence "all reality must be present to the Unity of the Infinite Thought."[9] "Everything finite we can doubt, but not the Infinite. . . . The All-Enfolder it is, and we know its name. Not Heart, nor Love, though these also are in it and of it; Thought it is, and all things are for Thought, and in it we live and move."[10]

The conclusion is a *non sequitur*. The syllogism has four terms! The word *infinite* means *indefinite* in the *minor*; whereas, in the *conclusion, Infinite* means to Royce what it means to Schopenhauer—that which is *without bound* of space or *succession* of time. There is absolutely nothing of logic to the whole argument! From the indefinite error in judgment, possible in regard to each and every object of knowledge we may conclude to the indefinite truth in judgment, possible in regard to each and every object of knowledge. *Contrariorum eadem est ratio.* But to rise to Infinite Truth, Universal Thought, the Hegelian Ego, as a logical deduction from the possibility of indefinite error of human judgment is a downright absurdity.

Here is another instance of the romantic flight from error to Truth:

That there is error is indubitable. What is, however, an error? The substance of our whole reasoning about the nature of error amounted to the result that in and of itself alone, no single judgment is or can be an error. Only as actually included in a higher thought, that gives to the first its completed object, and compares it

[7] *Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, p. 234.

[8] Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885; pp. 384-435.

[9] P. 433. [10] P. 435.

therewith, is the first thought an error. It remains otherwise a mere mental fragment, a torso, a piece of drift-wood, neither true nor false, objectless, no complete act of thought at all.[11]

This flight from error to the Hegelian deity is accepted by Dr. J. W. Buckham, a Congregational minister, Professor of Theology in Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, California, who writes: "This 'Inclusive Thought' is none other than God".[12]

What have we to say to this variant of the argument from error? It is utterly worthless! The only proof that Royce relies upon is the one we have outlined above. Error is correlative to truth. There is no error, but over against it is truth. Every error postulates a "unity of apperception", that is of true judgments. But to deify this "unity of apperception", to make it transcendent in the neo-Hegelian sense, is an altogether unwarranted flight of the Harvard professor's romantic imagination.

The only explanation of this lack of logic on the part of Dr. Royce is the fact that he is a romancer. He speaks from "heart-experience, longings, divinations of the soul", and not from reason. And it is in the light of romanticism that we must view much he has written about the Beloved Community. For, at very best, in all his philosophy we can recognize chiefly chips and sweepings from German workshops of the late eighteenth century, put together in a nondescript sort of mosaic, polished by what the doctor calls *logic*, and varnished with a veneer of beautiful and even Biblical language.

How nondescript was the mosaic of Royce's philosophy may be seen by his last summary of the doctrine that resulted from the manifold influences he experienced:

> The resulting doctrine of life and of the nature of truth and of reality which I have tried to work out, to connect with logical and metaphysical issues, and to teach to my classes, now seems to me not so much romanticism, as a fondness for defining, for articulating, and for expounding the perfectly real, concrete and literal life of what we idealists call the "spirit", in a sense which is indeed Pauline, but not merely mystical, super-individual; not merely

[11] *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, p. 431.

[12] "The Contribution of Professor Royce to Christian Thought", *Harvard Theological Review*, 1915, p. 221.

romantic, difficult to understand, but perfectly capable of exact and logical statement.[13]

The late professor's resultant *doctrine* in regard to life, truth, and reality, is a *fondness*! Would any but a romancer call his *fondness* a *doctrine*? This *fondness* is nothing but a survival of the *Welt Wille* of Schopenhauer. Despite all denials, we must insist that the doctor has here admitted the leaving out of reason, and the use of "emotion, heart-experience, longings, divinations of the soul . . . the best instruments of the philosopher". And, on this very account, his philosophy is "merely romantic, difficult to understand"; and not at all "capable of exact and logical statement".

This inexactness of statement is instanced by the above use of the Pauline word *spirit*. To any one who tries fairly to interpret the Pauline battle between Flesh and Spirit, πνεῦμα is man's higher soul, with its spiritual faculties—reason grace-led, and will-power grace-driven; and σάρξ is the complexus of man's lower faculties, disordered by concupiscence. To the idealist, Spirit is the Absolute, Universal Thought, the pantheistic Idea, the Ego. The inexactitude of the romancer leads Royce to say that this idealistic Spirit is Pauline! It is this same lack of exactness that leads him again and again to use Scripture in a way that misleads the unwary. Note, for instance, the preceding passage in which Royce makes the romancer to say. "We shall then be as gods, knowing good and evil." Does he really think that the tempter suggested to Eve a pantheistic unity with the Deity? Was idealism, in Royce's system of Old Testament interpretation, the undoing of the human race?

2. *Hegelian.* At Göttingen, under the direction of Lotze, and up to the year 1890, Royce claims he was never "very strongly under the influence of Hegel, nor yet of Green, nor of either of the Cairds."[14] And, in the preface to *The Religious Aspects of Philosophy*,[15] he says: "The author cannot call himself an Hegelian, much as he owes to Hegel". This charge of Hegelianism rankled unto the end in the feelings of Royce. His last work on philosophy, *The Problem of Christianity*[16] shows this rankling. And yet Hegelian he was.

[13] *Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, p. 511.

[14] *Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, p. 510.

[15] Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885, p. xi.

[16] New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914, vol. 1, p. xi.

This is the judgment of the late G. H. Howison, Professor of Philosophy in the University of California, who was at one time himself a Hegelian.[17] He finds that Royce began as an Hegelian, and later changed somewhat from monism toward pluralism. Not that he ever became a pluralist; no one could lay that change to the account of Royce. But after his lectures at Aberdeen on the Gifford Foundation, 1899, he

> continually dwelt more and more upon the notions of Loyalty and the Community. In these indications of a concrete and social idealism, we who earlier than he have accepted the view of a primordially harmonic pluralism (if indeed he has changed in that direction), may naturally take satisfaction and hope.[18]

We do not find, in the later writings of Royce, these grounds of hope that Howison indicates. There is the constant insistence on the Philosophy of Loyalty to the Beloved Community; but this "concrete and social idealism" is not at all an approach to "the view of a primordially harmonic pluralism". Royce remains a monist of the Hegelian idealistic type, despite his departures from Hegelian terminology, his constant urging of social loyalty to the community, and his romantic use of what he calls Will—a remnant of the voluntarism of Schopenhauer.

The modified Hegelianism of Royce is somewhat like to that of T. H. Green of England, and Otto Pfleiderer of Germany. It is based upon Kant's "transcendental unity of apperception". By this notion, Kant meant merely the unity of the finite consciousness—the sense of oneness, the abiding consciousness of selfhood. Through all the changes of mental states, there abides in the finite consciousness, according to Kantian terminology, this "transcendental unity of apperception", this sense of oneness, which makes possible the union of subject and object in the act of knowledge. In the Kantian theory of knowledge, this principle of the oneness of our inner life is rather unimportant. And yet, in the philosophy of Royce, this unimportant Kantian principle becomes the source of all truth and life. The "transcendental unity of apperception" is the Universal Thought in which

[17] Cf. "Josiah Royce: The Significance of his Work in Philosophy", one of the papers in the Royce jubilee volume of *The Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, p. 235.

[18] Ibid., p. 240.

finite mind knows the external object; it is the Hegelian Absolute. Finite things are the thoughts of the Infinite Consciousness. The Consciousness of the Beloved Community is the Consciousness of God. The Beloved Community is God. Loyalty to the Beloved Community is loyalty to God. And this is the sum and all of the theology of Dr. Royce—Loyalty to the Beloved Community. The only difference between the neo-Hegelianism of Dr. Royce and of others—such as Green, the two Cairds, and Pfleiderer—is this "concrete and social idealism", which consists in harping on the one string of Loyalty to the Beloved Community. Substitute the Beloved Community for Hegel's Absolute, and deify the Beloved Community by misinterpreting Scripture about it, and you have all that is fundamental in the religion of Dr. Royce. This theology we shall take up in some of its details.

II. Christology of Dr. Royce. 1. *The Beloved Community.* It seems an utter absurdity to speak of the Christology of an idealist. Quite so! If the monism of this Harvard professor of philosophy be true; if there be only one entity in the world; if the World Thought be the only reality; then the Christ becomes no more than an object of Universal Thought, not existing as a *thing in itself* outside of the Absolute, but merely included in the Kantian "transcendental unity of apperception." It is an utter absurdity to speak of the Christology of this Christ-idea, which has not even the Kantian *noumenon—the thing in itself*—to give objective validity to our idea. And yet this absurdity is carried out in detail by Dr. Royce.

He points the finger of scorn at the efforts of the various schools of Christology that divide pluralists. These efforts to show that "an individual man, and at the same time also God" has saved the world, have made the way of belief harder and harder. Give it all up. Come to the simple Religion of Loyalty to the Beloved Community:

> Simplify your traditional Christology, in order thereby to enrich its Spirit. The religion of Loyalty has shown us the way to this end.[19]

How simplify traditional Christology? By substituting the Beloved Community for Christ! By realizing that there never was "an individual man, and at the same time also God". The only historical fact of Christianity is "transcendental unity

[19] *Problem of Christianity*, vol. II, p. 424.

of apperception", a oneness of consciousness in regard to him whom folk call the Christ:

> The literal and historical fact has always been this, that in some fashion and degree those who have thus believed in the being whom they called Christ, were united in a community of the faithful, were in love with that community, were hopefully and practically devoted to the cause of the still invisible, but perfectly real and divine Universal Community, and were saved by the faith and by the life which they thus expressed.[20]

Now is not that twaddle? What is this faith in the Universal Community? Merely the acknowledgment that it is God:

> Let your Christology be the practical acknowledgment of the Spirit of the Universal and Beloved Community. This is the sufficient and practical faith.[21]

Hence not the Christ but this Beloved Community is the central idea of the Christology of Royce:

> The Pauline communities first were conscious of the essence of Christianity. Consequently those are right who have held, what the "modernists" of the Roman Church were for a time asserting . . . that the Church, rather than the person of the founder, ought to be viewed as the central idea of Christianity.[22]

Christianity teaches salvation through Christ. But there is no Christ in the Christology of Royce. And, so, unto the end, he insists that salvation is through this strange faith in the Beloved Community. Such was his act of faith, on the occasion of the jubilee dinner that celebrated his sixtieth anniversary: "We are saved through the Community".[23]

2. *Obscurity of this Christology.* Why is it that this absurd idealism, all this tommyrot about the Beloved Community, has been gulped down as Christianity? Because of the obscurity of its presentation. Dr. Royce is masterful in the use of English. But his meaning of ordinary words is not that of ordinary readers. And so the ordinary readers do not get at his ordinary meanings. The careful reader, who knows even a very little about idealism, will be convinced, on page after page of the works of this Hegelian, that Dr. Royce never once gives up his monism, his identification of all reality with Universal Thought; and yet writes in the every-day language

[20] Ibid., vol. II, p. 425.
[21] Ibid., vol. II, p. 428.
[22] *Problem*, vol. I, Preface, xxi.
[23] *Philosophical Review*, May, 1916, p. 511.

of ordinary religious folk. The result is that his ordinary readers hopelessly miss what is to them an out-of-the-ordinary meaning.

We do not say that the doctor intends to deceive. He writes clearly at times:

> If . . . we have on occasion used the word God, no reader is obliged to suppose that our idea agrees with his idea, for we have fully explained what our idea means. We repeat: As my thought at any time, and however engaged, combines several fragmentary thoughts into the unity of one conscious moment, so, we affirm, does the Universal Thought combine the thoughts of all of us into an absolute unity of thought, together with all the objects and all the thoughts about those objects that are, or have been, or will be, or can be, in the Universe. *This Universal Thought is what we have ventured, for the sake of convenience, to call God.* It is not the God of very much of the traditional theology. It is the God of the idealistic tradition from Plato downwards. . . . All the Powers that be exist as necessary facts in the Infinite Thought, and, apart from this thought, nothing is, that is. . . . God as Thought can be and is all in all.[24]

Readers who bear in mind the above frank statement of Royce's idealism, will not misunderstand what he terms Christianity, nor the various doctrines of the creed that he makes pretense to hold. His *Problem of Christianity* is solved by a pantheistic identification of all thought and objects of thought in God. "God as Thought can be and is all in all". Whatsoever doctrine of the creed Royce explains, must be understood in the light of this fundamental principle: "All the Powers that be exist as necessary facts in the Infinite Thought, and, apart from this Thought, nothing is, that is". If the pantheistic idealism of Royce be not remembered, the reader may be misled by his obscurity into the fancy that all his creed is perfectly orthodox. Not a few Protestant ministers were so misled.

An Iowa Congregational clergyman wrote in *Advance*[25] that the truth of the old-fashioned Calvinistic doctrines of Sin, Penalty, Divine Grace and Atonement were established, in *The Problem of Christianity*, "with an inexorable logic from which there is no escape". And the editor of *Advance* makes

[24] *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885), pp. 475 ff.

[25] November 13, 1913.

the thing more ridiculous by the headline, " Royce, Defender of the Faith ".

A reviewer of Royce's *Sources of Religious Insight*, writes in *Faith and Doubt*, a magazine established for the defense of orthodoxy, to hail Royce as the Moses of to-day, sent by God to lead us exiles from the doubts that surround us into the land of faith and freedom![26]

Even Very Reverend W. R. Inge, whose divisive criticism of the Gospels was so thorough during his Lady Margaret Professorship at the University of Cambridge that he became Dean of St. Paul's,—even this up-to-date critic does not fully realize that Royce is hopelessly an idealist. In his article on " Institutionalism and Mysticism ", the dean writes of *The Problem of Christianity*:

> The whole book is dominated by one idea, advocated with a *naïveté* which would hardly have been possible to a theologian,—the idea that churchmanship is the essential part of the Christian religion.[27]

Not so! The dominant idea of Royce is that the Christian religion, or the Beloved Community, is God, and that membership in the Beloved Community is a necessary fact,—a factor of Infinite Thought. For " apart from this Thought, nothing is, that is ".

The Dean of St. Paul's shows *naïveté*, when he tells us that, although these statements of Royce about the necessity of membership in the kingdom of God,

> in vigour and rigour would satisfy the most extreme curialist in the Society of Jesus, they are not a little startling in an American philosopher, who, as far as the present writer knows, does not belong to any " Catholic " Church.[28]

Were these ideas startling to the dean? Then he failed to see below the surface of the obscurity of Royce, into the depths of the hopeless monism of his theology. " The most extreme curialist of the Society of Jesus " is not likely to be so gullible as was the dean. With a reason that has been moulded by scholastic philosophy to think clearly, this " extreme curialist " is likely to keep in mind the sources of Royce's theology, and to see, behind the mask of Biblical and Christian language, the

[26] We cite these two publications from Edwin S. Carr, " Royce's Philosophy of Religion ", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1914, p. 283.

[27] *Hibbert Journal*, vol. XII, p. 770.

[28] Ibid., p. 771.

strange hodgepodge that the Harvard professor calls his philosophy,—a nondescript mosaic of Hegel's Absolute, Fichte's Moral Will, Schopenhauer's World Will, Kant's transcendental unity of apperception, and the Beloved Community. Let us remove that mask from a few of the elements of Royce's *systematic theology*.

3. *Sin.* According to the Christian, sin is an offense of the Creator. In the Christianity of Royce, sin is treason to the Beloved Community,—to the pantheistic God; and the sinner is the *traitor*. This *traitor* must have had a cause; it was "his religion, his way of salvation. It must have been the cause of a Beloved Community".[29] For there is no personal God to offend. The traitor betrays the cause of the Beloved Community by some voluntary act. That is sin. How will he be rid of that sin?

4. *Atonement.* According to the Christian, the soul is rid of sin by the merits of Jesus Christ. In the humbug, which Royce calls Christianity, the traitor cannot rid himself of sin. He is damned forever! The hell of this damnation is remorse of conscience! The deed is irrevocable. The treason has been, and can never be undone:

> By his own deed of treason, the *traitor* has consigned himself,—not indeed his *whole self*, but his self as the doer of this deed,—to what may be called the *hell of the irrevocable*.[30]

Not the Whole Self of the traitor is consigned to this *hell of the irrevocable*, but "his self as the doer of this deed". The Whole Self is the Beloved Community, the Hegelian God. "His self as the doer of this deed" cannot be a being distinct from the Whole Self. That would be pluralism. Royce is a monist, not a pluralist. Then what is this "self as the doer of this deed",—this self, which is consigned to the *hell of the irrevocable?* It must be another flight of the romantic imagination of Dr. Royce.

Is there no relief from this *hell of the irrevocable?* No, to "self as the doer of this deed," there is no relief! "His irrevocable deed is, for his moral consciousness, its own endless penalty. For that deed he can never forgive himself, so long as he knows himself."[31]

5. *Salvation.* Ah, but the Beloved Community forgives. That is atonement! That is salvation. Professor Royce, being an ideal-

[29] *Problem of Christianity*, vol. I, p. 278.
[30] Ibid., vol. I, p. 263.
[31] Ibid., vol. I, p. 280.

ist, does not admit physical death, immortality, salvation, etc., in the ordinary sense of those words. To him, *death* is the "ceasing of my former purpose"; by *immortality* "the new Self is really inclusive of and able to transcend the meaning of the old Self".[32] There is no personal Deity to give salvation to the immortal soul. Salvation is by the Beloved Community:

> If our Pauline Christian is to remain true to the Spirit of his original faith, the one essential article of his creed must be: The divine Spirit dwelling in the living Church redeems mankind.[33]

Just how the Beloved Community forgives, and saves; just what this neo-Hegelian Absolute, Universal Thought, "the divine Spirit dwelling in the living Church" does to save the "self as the doer of the deed" from the *hell of the irrevocable,* is not very clear from the fifty pages and more that Royce gives to Atonement.[34] The clearest explanation consists in this: first, good deeds by other members of the Community are made possible by the treason of the *traitor;* secondly, "the world . . . is better than it would have been had all else remained the same, but had that deed of treason not been done at all".[35] And so the sin turns out to be not a fall down, but a fall up. For the traitor, by his sin, makes the world better, and is incorporated more than before into the Beloved Community. And outside that Community, there is no salvation:

> The salvation of the individual man is determined by some sort of membership in a certain spiritual community,—a religious community, and in its inmost nature a divine community, in whose life the Christian virtues are to reach their highest expression and the spirit of the Master is to obtain its earthly fulfilment. In other words, there is a certain universal and divine spiritual community. Membership in that community is necessary to the salvation of man.[36]

And this invisible Church is the Beloved Community of Royce, the Absolute of Hegel, the Moral Will of Fichte, the World Will of Schopenhauer!

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

[32] *The World and the Individual* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1901), Second Series, p. 442.

[33] *Problem of Christianity,* vol. II, p. 366.

[34] Ibid., vol. I, pp. 271-323.

[35] Ibid., p. 307.

[36] Ibid., vol. I, p. 39.

Criticisms and Notes.

HISTORY OF ST. NORBERT, Founder of the Norbertine (Premonstratensian) Order, Apostle of the Blessed Sacrament, Archbishop of Magdeburg. By the Rev. Cornelius Kirkfleet, Ord. Praem. B. Herder: St. Louis. 1916. Pp. xvii–364.

Fr. Conrad Jannick, S.J., the Bollandist, says in the *Acta SS.* (Vol. 20, June 1): "I hardly know of an illustrious man—king, emperor or saint—whose life has been written oftener than Norbert's". The author of the present *History* gives the titles of more than thirty Lives that have been printed in various languages—Latin, German, Dutch, Polish, French, and Italian. On the long list only one is accredited to the English language — namely the brief narrative by M. Gaudens (London, 1886). Now when we consider, as Fr. Kirkfleet reminds us, that at one time there were no fewer than sixty-seven abbeys of Norbertine or White Canons dotting the landscape of Great Britain, we may wonder why so little is known of Norbert among English-speaking peoples of to-day. When we recollect, however, that the Protestant Reformers reformed the monks by robbing them of the monasteries, which in this case meant banishment from Britain, and moreover when we consider that three hundred years had to elapse before the religious orders might return to build new foundations—in the light of these simple facts the reason why the name of Norbert is relatively seldom seen or heard in English becomes obvious. But now, as the author further observes, that the Premonstratensian religious are once more occupied in missionary activities on both sides of the Atlantic, the life and labors of their illustrious founder will, it may be hoped, become more widely known.

Saint Norbert, it need hardly be said, was one of the leading figures of his age. Sprung of noble ancestry, he moved in the highest circles alike of State and Church. Embracing the clerical vocation, he lived even during the period of his subdiaconate a worldly and a pleasure-seeking life. Miraculously converted to God, the path of penitence led him to the establishment of a religious order whose spirit was to be the union of the contemplative with the active state. Adopting the rule of St. Augustine, the Premonstratensians—so-called from the valley Prémontré in which were laid the foundations of the order—were to be Canons Regular who should live under monastic discipline and at the same time minister to the spiritual needs of the faithful in the world. The story of Norbert's worldly youth, his career as the founder of a religious order, his labors as

the Archbishop of Magdeburg (one of the most important sees of medieval Germany); the persecutions he suffered, especially at the hands of false brethren—sufferings similar to, though surpassing if possible, those related of St. Charles Borromeo; the miracles he wrought; his saintly death—these are the leading features portrayed with ample detail by Fr. Kirkfleet in the present volume. It is a graphic story, as edifying as it is luminous and interesting. It throws a vivid light on both Church and State during the earlier decades of the twelfth century. St. Norbert and his contemporary and intimate friend, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, were the dominating forces of those years (1115-1134)—the great and true reformers of a worldly clergy. So that to read the life of St. Norbert is to get a clearer insight into the secular and ecclesiastical conditions of those times. It should be noted that the present volume is to be followed by another wherein the history of the Premonstratensian order will be narrated. We may hope that the coming volume will include an index to the present and that in a future edition of the book before us the titles of the chapters will be inserted in the table of contents.

LUMEN VITAE. L'Espérance du Salut au début de l'ère Chrétienne. Par Adhémar d'Alès. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1916. Pp. 283.

In times of trials and calamities, such as now have burst on the world, mankind needs strong motives of hope to bear up under the crushing weight of sorrow and woe. That is the author's aim, to reinforce the old hopes of Christian faith and to burnish them that they shine brightly in the present eclipse. From the high vantage ground of the philosopher of history, he reviews the great crisis through which humanity has passed, and shows that, whenever human society seemed on the brink of ruin, the hand of the Almighty reached out from the lowering clouds and stayed it in the path of destruction. Humanity has always instinctively felt that, when its miseries and afflictions were growing beyond its powers of endurance, God, though invisible to the eye, was near and girding himself to bring salvation. When the Roman Empire was crumbling, the world looked toward the Orient in obedience to old prophecies which revived the dying hopes of humanity; when the crash of the fall of Rome, sinking at last under the hammering of the barbarians, echoed through the world, a new era of peace was beginning to dawn, more glorious than the majesty of the Roman peace. What humanity did not find in the Greek mysteries or in the dreams of Oriental mysticism, it found in the good tidings of the kingdom of God. At present, when the horizon is shrouded in impenetrable darkness and the world groans under its burden of grief, again the light of hope will

be kindled and will dispel the night. This is the author's message. With the eye of the seer he descries the signs of God's approaching mercy. Before our eyes he unrolls the magnificent visions of the Beloved Disciple, to prove that the triumph of good will be final and speedy. The author's descriptions reflect the glowing colors of the Apocalypse, and his style possesses the grandeur of the prophets. His hymn of hope rolls on in majestic cadences. He has written with an inspired pen, and his words will bring comfort to those whose hearts have been illumined by the Light of the World.

CHRISTUS IN SEINER PRAEEXISTENZ UND KENOSE. Nach Phil. II, 5-8. I Theil: Historische Untersuchung von Heinrich Schumacher, Dozent der Neu-testamentlichen Exegese an der Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. — Von dem Bibel-Institut in Rom preisgekroent.—Rom: Verlag des Paepstl. Bibelinstitutes. 1914. Pp. XXXI–235. (Brettschneider: Roma, Via del Tritone.)

We reviewed, some time ago, several important books on Scriptural Introduction and Exegesis published under the auspices of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, and issued in Italian, German, and Spanish. The above volume was not noticed at the time. Its importance to students of New Testament criticism and history demands that we call attention to it, all the more since it comes from a professor in our central institution of theological studies. Moreover, it enjoys the special distinction of having been crowned as a prize publication by the Biblical Institute. The topic was originally proposed for competitive writing by the president of the Biblical Commission.

The purpose of the treatise is to establish, on historical and critical grounds, the value of the Pauline testimony to the Divinity of Christ. What St. Paul's christological view was we glean from various passages in his Epistles, but the basic expression of his conviction may be said to be found in his graphic picture of Christ's humility and dignity, in the Letter to the Philippians: "Hoc enim sentite in vobis quod et in Christo Jesu, qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se aequalem Deo", etc. This passage in a manner supplements the famous prayer passage in Chapter XVII of St. John, and runs parallel in fundamental thought with the synoptic, "Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo. Et nemo novit Filium nisi Pater: neque Patrem quis novit nisi Filius et cui Filius voluerit revelare". Similarly St. Luke. Our author had already discussed in a previous work the importance of the evangelical proof of Christ's divinity, through the authenticated self-revelation of the Messias. His works thus form a complete apology against the practical denial of the true

Godhead of Christ by the champions of modern Protestantism no less than by those of infidelity. The originality of Dr. Schumacher's work largely derives from his careful examination of the philological and historical value of the Patristic interpretation, that is the Greek, Latin, and Syrian writers. He shows a thorough knowledge of the researches of the great Pauline students of recent years who have thrown much fresh light upon the stylistic and idiomatic forms of speech in the writings of the Apostle of the Gentiles. At the same time the line of argumentation of Dr. Schumacher is, so far as a departure from old methods is allowable, independent.

THE TRUTH ABOUT CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. By George Searle, of the Paulist Fathers. The Paulist Press, New York. 1916. Pp. 316.

Many think it a superfluous task to elaborate a criticism of Christian Science or of the doctrinal book upon which it is based, Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health*. It seems to them to be taking the cult, or at least its deluded foundress, too seriously. On the other hand, when one considers the multitude of apparently intelligent men and women in almost every country who have been led astray by the insidious half-truths and the elusive fallacies of the new (even though old) teaching, it can hardly be a vain undertaking to expose the errors and dangers of a so-called religion which claims for itself the title of both Christian and Science. But while there should be no question that Mrs. Eddy's notorious book ought to be exposed, there might still remain a doubt whether the exposition should be systematic and quite serious or be discursive and tempered with a proportionate intermingling of humor and gentle irony. Something might be said in favor of each of these methods. The serious mode of treatment, however, is obviously the more difficult and on the whole is likely to be less successful, at least with those who are not among the disciples of Mrs. Eddy. It is probably for some such reason that so learned and accomplished a writer as Father Searle has chosen to deal with *Science and Health* not too ponderously nor too profoundly. The book should be exposed, but of course in a proportion of manner and extent due to its character. And this is what we find in the present critique. The author takes up successively each chapter of Mrs. Eddy's volume and points out in a good-natured style what elements of truth therein exist and what the dross of misstatement and inconsequence.

Perhaps the most insidious feature of Christian Science is its boasted faith-cures. Many are the disorders of mortal man which belief in its teaching and method is claimed to have healed. If a genuine Christianity can appeal to miracles as a criterion of a divine

guarantee, Christian Science can do likewise. The argument has undoubtedly deceived many, not excluding imperfectly instructed Catholics. The reasoning would indeed be conclusive if it could be proved that God had wrought a single genuine miracle in confirmation of Christian Science as such. This, of course, has never and can never be proved. Every one of the cures wrought through the mediancy of the cult can be explained by causes lying within the natural order. They call for no supernatural or even preternatural subsidy. In Mrs. Eddy's book there are chronicled eighty-five alleged cures wrought, it is claimed, through the ministries of Christian Science. Father Searle examines each, one after the other, and points out the weakness as to the evidence for the facts and as to the inconclusiveness of the explanation. The chapter in which this is done is likely to be most helpful. For the rest, his book is well worth while. It proclaims a warning to Christians who may be tempted to forsake the old-established truth for the new phantasies. Christian Scientists will perhaps not themselves be converted by the reading of the book, though it may lead them to reëxamine their bearings; but those who happen to be drifting in that direction may be warned to reset their sails and to steer back to safe harbor.

THE ANCIENT WORLD. From the Earliest Times to 800 A. D. By Francis S. Betten, S.J., Teacher of History at St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, Ohio, and at Creighton University Summer School, Omaha, Nebraska. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, New York, Chicago. Pp. 299.

To those who realize the divine purpose of creation, the study of the ancient world reveals wondrous mysteries and prophetic foreshadowings of the Messianic Redemption. Aside of the patriarchal dispensation we see in the main events of paganism, with its strivings after natural religion, the grand outlines of the vestibule that forms the entrance to positive Revelation and to Christianity. Above all do we trace in the history of Greece the divine instinct that leads, as through a cloistered atrium, step by step to the gate of the Hebrew Church, and thence into the sanctuary of the Church of Christ.

To gain a proper perception of this characteristic feature of ancient history the study of historical facts must be kept wholly free from that tendency to specialization in modern studies that sees in each age and people an organism, distinct in its cultivation of arts and sciences for their own sake, and with an aim at mechanical and secular progress only. Whilst modern pedagogy has supplied us with many excellent text-books of ancient history, few of them have taken account of the ultimate aim of all historical study to be the interpre-

tation of Christian development in all the spheres of human thought and action. Those that do so, like Fredet, Gazeau, and others of the same type, fail in presenting the matter in a form that corresponds to more recent methods of teaching history. They state the facts without that correlation to present-day science which recent archeology and comparative studies in other fields of experimental science have made possible, to facilitate obtaining a proper perspective of historical values. Secular textbooks on the other hand as a rule fail, as already indicated, in taking account of the relation of paganism and Judaism to the central fact of Christianity. Among the recognized standard manuals of Old World history for secular schools and colleges we have Professor Willis M. West's *The Ancient World*. Whilst perfect from the pedagogical viewpoint, it somewhat disappoints the Christian sense by assuming the evolutionary theory, which, for instance, ignores the Christian aspect of the purpose and fact of the Deluge as a prelude to the reconstruction of nations, an omission which gives a partial and misleading sense to such terms as "prehistoric", "stone age", and the like.

With the consent of Professor West and of the publishers of the original volume, Father Betten has undertaken to recast *The Ancient World* manual, and thus to present us with a text-book which may be said to be ideal. The work divides itself into two parts, apparently to be distributed over two classes comprising a complete course of ancient world history; that is, up to the middle or Carlovingian period. The three hundred pages of this first volume, beautifully printed with discriminating typography to aid the professor and student in marking the relative importance of the subject-matter, with topical analyses, splendid illustrations, and numerous maps finely drawn, cover the Oriental and mainly Greek civilization in a way that completes without crowding the survey. The diction is clear and to the point. The scope includes every aspect of ancient culture in religion, science, letters and arts, as revealed by the latest archeological and linguistic discoveries.

Apart from its use as a school-text the book is admirable as an aid to analysis for the general reader of history. This part in particular lights up the astonishing qualities of the Greek mind in selecting the material on which the earliest Christian schools, and the entire Christian system of philosophy, based their teachings, illuminating what natural genius had produced, by the perfecting light of grace through Christ. We look with pleasant anticipation for the complementary volume.

THE SOCIALISM OF TODAY.—A Source-Book of the Present Position and Recent Development of the Socialist and Labor Parties in all Countries, consisting mainly of Original Documents. Edited by William English Walling, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Jessie Wallace Hughan, Harry W. Laidler and other members of a Committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. Henry Holt & Co., New York. 1916. Pp. xvi—642.

The subtitle of this volume is so explicit and even so pointedly suggestive of its implications, that little is left for the reviewer to do in the rôle of introducer. In the first place the book has to do with "the Socialism of to-day." It is not concerned with Socialism of yesterday, save inasmuch as the immediate past is living in the actual present; nor with the Socialism of to-morrow except in so far as the latter is even now in the process of fulfilling the promises of the present. The editors would remind us that until quite recently all books about Socialism, whether pro or anti, have been chiefly theoretical. Theories of Socialism are now of secondary importance; for, about the dawn of the present century, Socialist and Labor parties became important political factors with programs of reform, the sincerity and practicality whereof Mr. Walling thinks were "beginning to be tested by experience." A critic, of course, might here interpose the observation that the *Socialist* programs of reform where experience has tested their "practicality"—their "sincerity" will readily be granted—have not been *socialistic;* and where they have been socialistic, they have always been proven impractical.

Be this as it may, it is quite the fact that since the year 1900, when the new stage of Socialist literature begins, Socialism has been presented, both by Socialists and their opponents, "as a movement". The time for a third stage, the editors believe, is now at hand, when the Socialist movement should be described objectively just as it is—not biasedly for or against the movement. This obviously can only be done by appealing to the documents, wherein the Socialist proposals are embodied, formulated by assemblies representing the movement or by individuals recognized by Socialists as entitled to speak for their party. And since this is precisely what the editors of the present volume have had in view, they may be justly allowed the claim that "*the volume is the first international and comprehensive source-book dealing with the Socialist movement in any language*" (the author's italics). The large mass of material is grouped under two headings: (1) the Socialist parties of the world; (2) the Socialist parties and social problems.

The former heading covers in the first place all the nations of Europe. In the second place the socialist movement in the United States is followed—the national program, the different State programs, the various policies and tactics being in turn surveyed. The movement in Canada and in Spanish America, likewise in the British Isles, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, is also duly described. Even antipodal China is not omitted. In the second half of the volume such topics as the Socialist attitude toward the general strike, arbitration of labor disputes, unemployment, the high cost of living, agriculture, the land trusts, taxation, immigration, militarism, the woman question, education, and toward several other important problems, are discussed.

It should be noticed that, while the purpose of the work is to present the Socialist position on these problems, the reform measures advocated for the most part are, as was said above, not distinctively Socialistic. Though emanating from men who are Socialists they are such as commend themselves to most sanely thinking minds. It is a well-known method adopted by the Socialist propaganda to mingle with a few specifically Socialistic principles and proposals a very large percentage of sound and practical reformatory ingredients and thus attract the wage-earners to their ranks. The other equally characteristic policy of Socialists is to identify themselves with practically the whole body of the working class. Though the majority of labor unionists as well as the rank and file of unorganized labor are non-Socialist and to a large extent are anti-Socialist, the Socialists extend the loving mantle of their protection over all the toilers, and whether the latter admit it or not they are given to understand that only under the Socialist aegis may they hope to find the biggest pay for the least work, together with all the other good things of life. Consequently the Socialists spare no pains to imbue trade unions with the Socialist spirit. Hence we find the international congress held at Stuttgart in 1907 declaring it to be "the interest of the working-class in every country that close and permanent relations should be established between the unions and the (Socialist) party. . . ." And further, that "the unions will not fully perform their duty in the struggle for the emancipation of the workers unless a thoroughly Socialist spirit inspires their policy." And so on. Needless to say, Unionism and Socialism are far from being identical. The latter would enfold the former, but the former has hitherto held to its individuality and refused to blend with the latter, though it must be recognized that many Unionists belong to the Socialist Party and vice versa.

Nevertheless *Socialism of To-day* is, from a historical and descriptive point of view, an eminently serviceable and useful book.

It is what its title suggests, a "source-book" of information regarding what may be called the official pronouncements of the Socialist Party. And yet Socialism as a world-wide "movement" is something more than the aggregate of methods and means of social reformation proposed by Socialist leaders. Underlying and permeating it are certain philosophical principles. These are not mentioned in the present volume. Only in the concluding chapter on Education is there any indication given of the tendency of those principles. And even there the indication, while significant in kind, is not very ample in degree. No one knows better than Mr. Walling the full and universal content and bearing of the principles urging onward the Socialist movement. In his former volume on the *Larger Aspects of Socialism* he has set down and developed those principles at considerable length. We have reviewed the latter book in these pages, and it will suffice to say that, while in the present work we have Socialism treated as a system of social amelioration, in the former work we see Socialism as a philosophy. And it is principles that move the world, whether for weal or woe.

BERNAL DIAZ DEL CASTILLO. Being some account of him, taken from his True History of the Conquest of New Spain. By R. B. Cunninghame Graham. Dodd, Mead & Co.: New York. 1916. Pp. 264.

Bernal Diaz of Old Castile was the close associate, the right-hand man indeed, of Hernando Cortés, in the conquest of Mexico. From the letters of Cortés and from those of Pedro de Alvarado much is known of the founding of New Spain upon the ruins of the Aztec semi-barbarism: but much more is to be learnt from Bernal Diaz concerning the personality of Cortés himself, his companions, and their enemies, and concerning the journeyings, hardships, sufferings, fightings, deaths of the Conquistadores. It was largely because most of these details of personality and events had been passed over by the writers who before him had essayed the history of the Conquest, that Diaz, when he had reached the age of more than four score years, took the pen into his gnarled fingers—more wont to handle the sword and horse—to write the story of the Conquest, a tale more wondrous in its sober truth than all the legends of knight-errantry. Although half a century had elapsed since the old soldier had fought side by side with the Conqueror, he paints the persons with whom he marched or fought, and the things whereof he was part, with a minuteness and vividness that is more than photographic. As Mr. Graham observes, "he writes of men round the camp fire, preserves their nicknames, tells of their weaknesses, and makes us see, not only them, but himself, just as they sat and talked, cleaning their arms,

or softening their wounds with grease taken from a dead Indian, for 'medicines we had none'. Withal, he was a man, honest and steadfast to his leaders, patient in hardship, and a great lover of good horses, a taste befitting to a conqueror, for by the aid of horses 'under God' Mexico was subdued. So much he loved them that he has set down the names and colors, qualities and faults of all the horses and mares which came in the first fleet that sailed from Cuba with Cortés. . . . Here and there through his book are scattered passages that the whole world knows or should know, such as the fall of Mexico, with the sudden ceasing of the tumult that had gone on for ninety days, 'so that we, the soldiers, all were deaf, as if we had been in a belfry with all the bells ringing, and they had all suddenly been stopped'."

The character sketch of Cortés drawn by Diaz is a masterpiece of observation, insight, dissection, and fidelity. If the present volume had done nothing more than copy this pen-picture drawn by the aged soldier, who knew his general as did none other, who admired and loved his commander, and yet, when justice demanded, could point to his mistakes, and even on occasion pour out "two thousand curses on his head"—if, I say, the book had done no more than give us thus *chef d'œuvre* of character-painting, it would deserve well of the reading world. For its sake one can almost pardon the unpardonable sneers and gibes which Mr. Graham loses no opportunity of flinging at the simple faith of the Spaniards. These rather frequent smart hits at safe objects are the only faults we have to find with his work. Since the portrait of Cortés "is one of the most complete and most minute presentments of a man in any literature", no apology need be made for transferring it to these pages. Perhaps, moreover, it may serve to correct impressions of the Conqueror gathered from other less authoritative sources. Diaz first tells of the death of Cortés:

"After having received the Sacraments, our Lord Jesus Christ was pleased to summon him from this troublous world. So he died on the second of December, 1547 . . . he was buried in the Chapel of the Dukes of Medina-Sidonia, and afterward his bones were brought to New Spain. In the year in which we came with him from Cuba to New Spain, which was in 1519, he used to say in conversation with us that he was thirty-four years of age, so that with the twenty-eight that passed until his death, he was just sixty-two. . . . The motto and the quarterings that he bore in his arms were fitting for a brave man, and suitable to his heroic deeds. As they were written all in Latin, and I know none of it, I do not set them down."

The veteran raconteur then goes on to speak about the appearance of Cortés. "He was of good stature and large body, well proportioned and muscular. The color of his face was rather ashen, and his general aspect not very cheerful. If his face had been longer, it would have become him better. Sometimes his look was pleasant and at others grave. His beard was black and grew a little sparsely on his chin. His hair, which in those days he wore long, was of the same color as his beard. His chest was deep, his shoulders broad, and he was thin and had but little belly. His legs were well set on, but bowed a little. He was a good horseman, skilful at all weapons on horseback and on foot, and above all had a good heart and courage, which matter more than all the rest. I heard that in his youth in Hispaniola he was much given to women, and that he was engaged in several duels with brave and skilful men on that account, and always came off with the victory. He had a sword-cut on his lower lip which you could see by looking closely at it, but it was covered by his beard. This scar he got in one of these adventures. In everything—in his presence, walk, his conversation, and his mode of speech, in eating and his dress—he showed he was a person of high rank. His clothes were always of the fashion and the period in which he lived, though he did not dress in rich silks or satins, but plainly, and always all his things were very clean. Neither did he care for great gold chains, but wore a little chain about his neck of exquisite workmanship. From it there hung a jewel with the image of Our Lady, the Blessed Virgin Mary, with her precious Son in her arms. The motto round it was in Latin—that is to say, upon the side on which appeared Our Lady. Upon the other side was our Lord St. John the Baptist, with another motto. He wore a handsome diamond ring upon his finger, and in his cap (for in those days caps were in fashion) he wore a medal with a figure on it that I cannot recall. After that time, as he grew older, he used to wear a plain cap without a medal. He was served richly, like a great lord, by two grooms of the chamber, a controller of his household, and many pages, and all the service of his house was splendid, with many ewers of silver and gold. At midday he ate moderately, and drank a cup of wine, but mixed with water. At supper he took little and ate sparingly. He never cared the least for delicacies or for costly dishes, but only when he was obliged for state to make a show. He was most affable with all his captains and his comrades, especially with all of us who had come from Cuba in his train. He was a Latinist and, I heard tell, a Bachelor of Law, and when he talked with lawyers or with Latinists he answered what they said in Latin with the best of them. Also he was a little of a poet, and made songs in metre and in prose. When he discussed or argued, he spoke

quietly, and with good choice of words. He prayed each evening, using a book of Hours, and he heard Mass with great devotion. He held Our Lady, the Blessed Mary, as his chief advocate—as indeed every faithful Catholic should. Also he venerated our Lord St. Peter, and our Lord St. James, together with our Lord St. John the Baptist, and was an almsgiver. When he swore, all that he said was, 'By my conscience', and when by any chance he was angry with any soldier of our friends, he said, 'Oh, bad luck to you'. When he was very much enraged, a vein swelled in his throat and on his forehead also, and now and then, if he was very much stirred up, he spat upon the ground. He never used bad words or insulting language either to his captains or his soldiers. In all things he was patient; and when the soldiers, which happened now and then, answered him discourteously, the most he said was, 'Silence! Go with God, and in the future take more care in what you say, or it will be the worse for you'. In all things touching war he was most obstinate, and never listened to our counsels or anything we said. . . . I do not care to tell all his adventures, for it takes up too much time . . . so I return to speak about himself, and tell you that he was very fond of cards and dice, and when he played at them he always played fairly, repeating now and then certain old saws, such as are loved by players at such games. In all the conquests that we made, he was most careful, and many a night he never slept, walking from post to post to see the sentinels, and if they kept good watch. Sometimes he used to go into the soldiers' quarters, and if he found them sleeping without their shoes, or with their armor laid aside, he would reprove them, saying that a bad sheep felt its own wool too heavy for it, and other slighting words. . . . When we first came to the New Spain, he was thin and lean in his condition, but when we came back from Honduras he grew stouter and began to dye his beard. . . . In California and in the expedition to Honduras he had evil fortune, and in many other things after New Spain was won . . . it may be to prepare his soul for heaven; for so I judge it, as he was a good knight and a great devotee of the Blessed Virgin and of all the other saints. I pray the Lord to pardon all his sins, and pardon mine, too, and give me a good ending, which after all is more important than all the conquests and the victories that we had in the New Spain."

Having yielded to the temptation of quoting this somewhat lengthy description of the Conqueror, the reviewer can hardly refrain from calling attention to some of the miniatures drawn by Diaz of his other companions in arms, particularly as the touches show that the octogenarian warrior had lost none of his sense of humor under the stress of uncounted woundings, hungerings and thirstings. Although,

as Mr. Graham remarks, Cortés forgot to name his officers and men, fifty years afterward Diaz remembered each individually and sees them in minutest detail. In his vast gallery he paints dozens of them with a few strokes, so that those who read Diaz could not fail to recognize many of the humblest soldiers should they hereafter happen to meet them in the flesh. For instance, having said a few things about Luis Marin, Diaz goes on to add: "There was another man that came with us, whom we called Beberreo, for he was a great drinker, and one called el Galleguillo, a very little man—the Indians ate him. Another first-rate soldier was Juan Escalante, always well dressed, and a good rider; he turned Franciscan friar. This Escalante broke his vows and came back to the world to triumph, and then after a month went back again to his convent, and became a first-rate monk." Farther on, Bernal says of Pedro de Guzman that "he was very handsome, and married Dona Francisca de Coltierra, a Valencian lady. He and his wife, together with a negro and some horses they had, died frozen, and may God have pardoned their misdeeds. Santos Hernandez came from Soria, and though an old man, he was so good a rider that we all called him the good old horseman. He also was a scout, and died naturally at last."

No one escaped the observation of the old Conquistador. Amongst the soldiers he notices that there were four men called Solis. "One was an old man and died fighting valiantly when Mexico was won. The second, as he was full of fun, we called Casquete. The third we called Solis-Behind-the-Door, for he was always sitting behind the door of his house to spy out what was passing in the street. The fourth always called himself Solis-of-the-Battles, but we," Diaz remarks, "called him Solis-of-the-Silk-Doublet, for he was very fond of silk."

With his old adversary Pedro de Ircio, Diaz is less kindly, for he sets down all his faults. "Pedro de Ircio was of a tricky nature, and middling height. He waddled as he walked, and was a babbler, and also talked about his exploits in Castile. What we saw of him and what we knew of him was not worth talking of, so we called him another Agrages-without-Works."

As one frees oneself from the spell of the old warrior's rehearsals, the question is apt to suggest itself: what veridical value are we to attach to these reminiscences? May they not after all be but the projections into the dim past of the imaginings that haunted the brain of a garrulous old man? On the other hand, the question loses sight of the law of memory according to which the aged retain and revive the impressions of early life more vividly than those of yesterday. However, Diaz was too sensibly and shrewdly reflective a mind not to have foreseen so obvious an objection. Accordingly he

both states and answers it; or rather, the objection had been urged against him by the critics of his own day who envied the old man his gift of memory, just as they might have been annoyed by his wit, humor, pathos, or any of the gifts they did not share with him. And so we hear Diaz disclaiming it to be much that he remembered the names of his companions, "for, though we were in all five hundred and fifty comrades, we lived like brothers, and always talked together, in the wars, on watch, and in the battles and all the hazards of our lives. We talked of those who had been slain and about those who had been carried off and sacrificed. I further say that I remember all of them so well that I could paint or sculpture all their faces if I knew how to draw . . . even their way of walking and each detail of their faces and their forms . . . and how each of them went into battle, and the courage that he showed . . . and I thank God and also His Blessed Lady Mother that I escaped from being sacrificed to idols and for having spared me to preserve their memory."

And thus it came to pass that it was just the faithful loving memory of this old soldier that saved the names of the humble Conquerors from utter oblivion. Perhaps, "some day in those far-distant times when every man shall reap the fruit of his own labor and enjoy the meed of honor that his deeds have gained him, some government in Mexico will raise a column to their memory, with their names written on its base, and with a statue of the man who rescued them from the oblivion into which they fell. It might stand opposite the Cathedral, which itself is built upon the site of the great temple on whose steps so many of the Conquerors had been led out and sacrificed to the sad, hollow booming of the great drum which impressed Diaz with such horror when he heard its melancholy sound."

Diaz himself seems to have felt that something more was due to the Conquerors. We catch this thought in his expressive apostrophe to Fame, which might well find its reëcho in our own age: "I ask the illustrious Lady, Fame, what has she done for us, the Conquerors, and for the dead? Where are their sepulchres? What hatchments are there on their tombs? To this can be answered shortly — O excellent and illustrious Fame, so much desired and praised amongst the virtuous: I do not wish to see thee, nor to hear thy name. . . . I tell thee, Lady, that of all the soldiers who came to the New Spain from Cuba with Cortés, up to this year of grace 1588 in which I write, but five are left. Their sepulchres, I say, are, for the most part, in the bellies of the Indians. Those are their sepulchres and their hatchments, but their names should be written down in golden letters, for they came here to serve God and His Majesty the King, to spread the light in darkness . . . and also to get riches, a thing which commonly all mankind pursues."

But this will do. For the rest, Mr. Graham has written a very interesting introduction to the monumental work of Diaz, *The True History of the Conquest*. The manuscript of the latter work, in one large folio volume, comprising 594 pages, bound in old leather, is preserved in the archives of Guatemala. It was published and edited critically for the first time by Genaro Garcia in Mexico, 1904. An English translation of this edition was made by Alfred Maudsley and published with introduction and notes for the Hakluyt Society (3 vols. London, 1908). Several earlier translations (English, French, and German) exist, but since they are all taken from the unreliable edition published under the auspices of Fray Alonso Remon (Madrid, 1632), they are to be used with caution. The present volume may be regarded, as was said above, as an introduction to the original; but readers who do not care to peruse the latter more detailed narrative may be satisfied with the present condensation. Mr. Graham is in hearty sympathy with his author. He apparently possesses some personal traits in common with the old Conquistador. Not unlike the Spanish warrior, the Scottish writer is "pawky". Both are shrewd and canny observers as well of men as of things. If only the cold-blooded Northerner had kept his caustic pen from prodding at the warm-souled religion of the Southerner, his work would have been in every respect praiseworthy. On the other hand, it may perhaps not be possible for one who has been brought up within the chill mists of the Kirk to understand and much less to sympathize with the fervent faith of Catholic Spain. Such inability is a negative, or rather a privative, condition, a defect if not a vice, and will by no means explain or condone the numerous "flings" at the Catholic faith in which Mr. Graham indulges. The simple, honest, straightforward character of the Catholic hero whom he honors himself by admiring ought to have had a more restraining influence in this connexion.

VOCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY. Its Problems and Methods. By H. L. Hollingworth, Associate Professor of Psychology, Columbia University. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 336.

Efficiency is the watchword of the hour. Waste is looked upon as the capital sin and the unpardonable crime by an age of science that has learned to express everything in terms of quantity. Not only to the physical resources does this anxiety for results extend; it includes also what nowadays we are wont to call human material. So the efficiency expert has arrived, whose office it is to increase the economic productivity of both men and things and to extract from them every particle of usefulness. The craze for efficiency has led

to a disparagement of the old-fashioned classical education, which wastes so much time in the pursuit of unprofitable studies; and where the advocates of efficiency have had their way, it has become superseded by vocational training, which subordinates the entire formation of the child to standards of usefulness and to questions of practical results. From this it is only one step to the new science, called vocational psychology, which pretends to determine a man's fitness for a certain calling in life by laboratory tests. These strictures, of course, apply only to the excesses of a movement that in itself is not without merit, if it acknowledges its inherent limitations.

In some cases a laboratory test is necessary and also possible; as when an engineer is examined with regard to his ability to distinguish colors. Similar tests may be resorted to when there is question of occupations that involve a particularly severe strain on certain organs or require a high degree of sensitiveness to specific irritants. There is no doubt room, though somewhat restricted, for vocational psychology, and hence the book which gives occasion to the foregoing remarks deserves careful attention and will prove serviceable to those engaged in the training of youth.

Unnecessarily the author goes out of his way to cast a slur on prayer and the use of relics. These things have nothing to do with his science; the efficacy of prayer cannot be measured by his apparatus; it belongs to a region where weights and measures avail nothing. Equally gratuitous, though in keeping with the modern tendency, is his flank attack on the humanities. This is precisely the quarrel which we have with vocational psychology, that it considers man too much with regard to his capacity for productive work, whereas his first object is to build up a strong moral personality and to store up energy which eventually will seek an outlet in the daily tasks of life.

The various tests designed cannot reach that which really counts in life and what is designated as the personal equation. Some Frenchman has said: "L'homme est une quantité indeterminable"; and there is much truth in the observation. The real possibilities of a man are found out when he is confronted by some great crisis which searches him through and through; but the psychometrical appliances of the laboratory cannot gauge him or get his full measure, simply because quantitative measurement cannot be introduced into the processes of the mind. We may be able to reduce to quantitative terms the reaction time of a sensation, but the thinking processes, the emotions, and the volitional activities refuse to be thus registered. We do not share the author's hope of the future development and wide range of applicability of his science; its limitations lie in the nature of things, that is in the spiritual character of the

mental life of man. In a way, the modern vocational psychologist lapses into the same error which he ridicules in the phrenologist and the physiognomist. To determine a man's abilities from the formation of his skull or his outward features is but a cruder form of the same fallacy which attempts to read a man's soul by means of his psychograph. In both cases there is a lack of correlation between the thing which we wish to know and the phenomena which come under our observation.

Serious objections stand against the claims and pretensions of this new science. Its implications, if not its actual professions, are decidedly materialistic; its tendencies are toward a lowering of educational ideals; and lastly, and this is the gravest objection, it endangers personal liberty by its persistent appeal to social control over human nature.

This fundamental divergence of opinion understood, we admit that the author has collected much curious and interesting material, and that much benefit may accrue to the science of education from his particular field of research. He has given us a very thought-provoking book, which will stimulate the sense of observation and may prevent many a vocational blunder, with its subsequent regret.

C. B.

Literary Chat.

Even the spiritual life will gain if it adopts scientific methods and makes judicious use of the various pedagogical devices which are the fruit of the modern study of experimental psychology. The application of just such helps (which our age has, if not discovered, at least perfected) to the study and teaching of the Christian life is the distinctive feature of a handbook published by the Brothers of the Sacred Heart (*Manuel de Perfection Chrétienne et Religieuse.* Desclée, De Brouwer & Cie., Paris). The venture is a complete success. Headings which give quick orientation, synoptic tables which facilitate reviews, a discerning use of small and heavy type, intelligent paragraphing, a stimulating questionary, contribute to make this an ideal book from the pedagogical viewpoint, not to mention its attractive and handy make-up. This much for the method and the externals. The matter is not inferior to the form; it is solid, well selected, and lucidly presented. The great masters of the spiritual life are laid under contribution and appropriate texts of Scripture abound. There is an interesting and sometimes startling vividness in the exposition of familiar truth, as an illustration of which the following striking sentence may serve: "Mollesse et perfection! Deux termes qui jurent, car seuls les violents parviennent à la gloire." For masters of novices this manual is invaluable; at the same time, it will prove a mine of purest ore for the pulpit speaker and a safe guide in the direction of souls. We voice only one regret, that it is not in English, for the French idiom, in which it is written, will of necessity limit its sphere of usefulness. The Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Metuchen, New Jersey, have a limited supply of copies on hand.

P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, have published a well bound and well printed prayerbook for the Junior Sodalists (*The Book of the Junior Sodalists*

of our Lady. Compiled and arranged by Father Elder Mullan, S.J.). It contains all the usual prayers and necessary instructions and possesses the additional advantage of being cheap.

Holy Mass should always be the centre and radiating focus of popular devotion. Through recent Eucharistic legislation and practice this has become more patent than perhaps heretofore. Nothing makes more for robust and sane piety than proper attendance at the Holy Sacrifice. Father W. B. Sommerhauser, S. J., has compiled a book which will help students to reap abundant harvests of grace from their assistance at the daily Mass. (*Students' Mass Book and Hymnal.* B. Herder, St. Louis.)

The problem of giving religious instruction to the 1,500,000 Catholic children who are attending public schools in this country is one that has tested the best intelligence and the zeal of many a pastor of souls. The insistence of the problem is no less obvious than its importance. The solution, however, is not so easy; but here as elsewhere organization of the forces of instruction commends itself as at once effective and feasible. How such organization may be formed and carried on is succinctly and happily explained in a little pamphlet, *Practical Plan of the Catholic Instruction League*, compiled and published by Fr. John M. Lyons, S.J. (Holy Family Church, Chicago).

The brochure is likely to be known already by readers of this REVIEW since it is in its second edition and some of its material has previously appeared in America and in *The Queen's Work.*

The pages devoted to vacation schools bid us pause. From them we learn that the daily Bible schools (non-Catholic, of course) have reached their highest development in Philadelphia. Eighteen colleges furnish teachers, money, and supplies. Fourteen denominations coöperate. On the list of these Bible schools there are five for Hungarian children, twelve for Italian, ten for negroes, eighteen for Jewish boys and girls. There are 330 teachers to look after children of thirty-nine nationalities. Eighty churches, tents, and settlement houses had their doors wide open from 10 July to mid-August, and children from four years to fourteen received instruction in the Bible, practical philanthropy, and manual training.

Amongst the 25,000 children listed in these vacation Bible schools it would be interesting to know how many were Catholic. It is good to hear that Catholic vacation school work is carried on successfully in New York, St. Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati, Boston, and elsewhere.

The Society of the Divine Saviour (St. Nazianz, Wisconsin) publishes the *Manna Almanac for Children.* Sweet and nutritious food is in it—prepared especially "for little minds and little hearts and little souls." Sketches of the lives of youthful saints, cheerful stories, a number of poems, riddles and other such things there are, together with an interspersal of fairly good pictures, the whole making a desirable companion for the child's journey of 1917. If to it be added the monthly *Manna* for children, the little ones will be fairly supplied with healthful reading during the coming year.

A Sister of St. Joseph has compiled a series of readers entitled *The Ideal Catholic Readers* (The Macmillan Co., New York). Judging by the fourth in the series, the title is well chosen. If reading in the elementary grades comprises two periods, the period of learning to read occupying the first three years, and the immediately ensuing period of reading to learn, then the *Fourth Reader* introduces the latter period. And so the compiler has provided many pieces, a goodly number of which the child, having read, will do well to learn. The Bible, history, nature, the best literature have furnished of their choicest; so that the book may be said to serve at once the art of reading, intellectual growth, the fostering of noble ideals and the cultivation of the higher life.

St. Michael's Almanac for 1917, published and printed by the Mission Press, Techny, Ill., is a credit to the Society of the Divine Word, as regards both its contents and its mechanical make-up. The stories are edifying and well selected, and the illustrations attractive and varied.

The publishers of *The Official Catholic Directory*, we are informed, are making unusual efforts to have the 1917 edition ready as early as possible. Compilation of the lists of names and addresses and the other ecclesiastical information which fill the pages of this most useful annual, is a task of formidable proportions. Question forms are sent out by the thousands and a stamped envelope bearing return directions is sent with each blank, so that the person addressed, whether pastor, chancellor, rector of a seminary, superior of a religious community, university, college, or other religious institution, has but to fill in and mail the answers. So thorough-going are the measures adopted by the publishers for securing full, accurate, up-to-date, and authetic information about the Church in America, that it is a pleasure to bespeak here the coöperation of the clergy. On their care and promptitude in making returns depend the value and service of the *Directory*, which is sanctioned as the authorized year-book for the United States on matters pertaining to the diocesan clergy lists and ecclesiastical and religious statistics in general. It is highly desirable to have one's copy of the *Official Catholic Directory* at the beginning of the year, and that is possible only if the information blanks are properly returned to the respective chanceries.

We are reminded in this connexion of a vital item of our church statistics which for several reasons deserves to be better reported—the number of converts each year. Several months past one of our correspondents called attention to the importance of having official returns of conversions made to the chanceries so that they in turn could pass them on to the *Directory* for publication. Only sixty-nine dioceses reported the number of conversions last year. It would be well to have a substantially complete record in figures of what the Church is really doing in the various sections of the Union toward bringing non-Catholics to a knowledge of the Truth.

The Press of the Pontifical Biblical Institute issues, among other publications of recent date, an *Elenco Alfabetico delle Pubblicazioni Periodiche Biblioteche di Roma*. The largest number by far of important theological publications seem to come from Germany.

Mr. Harold M. Wiener, the London barrister, well known for his studies in Pentateuchal criticism, publishes through the Bibliotheca Sacra Company a brochure on the *Date of the Exodus*. He believes that owing to the excavations at Pithom and Raamses, we can determine not merely the reign but the year in which the great pilgrimage took place. That year would be the second (or first) of Merneptah, the successor of the Pharaoh Rameses, on the fifteenth day of the month of Abib. (Bibliotheca Sacra Co., Oberlin, Ohio.)

Der *Wanderer Kalender* for 1917 (St. Paul, Minnesota) is an exceptionally fine piece of almanac production. The illustrations are of a superior type and the stories and "Kurzweil" are good and abundant.

Voices of the Valley (P. J. Kenedy & Sons) by F. McKay is a gleaner's journey through the field of Christian perfection. She gathers brief thoughts of saints and reflections of sages on faith and hope, charity, humility, patience, poverty, meekness, obedience, purity, simplicity, mercy, kindness, and peace, in order that these may find an answer in the heart of the casual reader.

Bishop Joseph Busch of St. Cloud now issues also a German edition of his monthly *My Message* (*Meine Botschaft*) for his people. It is a new plan for making an official organ of the diocese absolutely reliable. There are two editors, Fathers Markert and Grunenwald; but the Bishop himself writes the leaders, signed and full of interest as well as of apostolic spirit. Type, illus-

trations, and general make-up are quite attractive, as befit such an organ if it is to appeal to the faithful of to-day.

We have previously had occasion to call attention to Fr. Homan's pamphlet, *Prohibition, the Enemy of Temperance.* We wish now to bespeak interest in the same author's more recent study, *National Prohibition: Its Supreme Folly.* The fruits of much observation, extensive reading, and reflection are here summed up. There is hardly a phase of Prohibition—*pro* or *anti*—that is left unconsidered. It is no intemperate plea for temperance nor prohibitive inveighal against Prohibition. On the contrary, it is a calm, thoughtful, well-informed defence of moderation in the use of alcohol and a dispassionate objective demonstration that National Prohibition does not point the way to the abolition of the drink evil. Orders and communications respecting the booklet should be sent to the Rev. J. A. Homan, St. Francis Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MANUEL DE PERFECTION CHRÉTIENNE ET RELIGIEUSE. Société Saint-Augustin, Desclée, De Brouwer & Cie., Paris; Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Metuchen, N. J. 1913. Pp. 589.

LE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DRIANT. Allocution prononcée en l'Église Notre-Dame de Paris par le R. P. Barret, le 28 Juin, 1916. Se vend au profit des Œuvres de Guerre de la Ligue des Patriotes. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1916. Pp. 16. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50; 0 *fr.* 60 *franco.*

HISTORICAL.

ROMA. Ancient, Subterranean, and Modern Rome in Word and Picture. By the Rev. Albert Kuhn, O.S.B., D.D. With Preface by Cardinal Gibbons. Parts XVII and XVIII. Complete in 18 parts, published bi-monthly, with 744 illustrations in the text, 48 full-page inserts, and 3 plans of Rome. Benziger Bros., New York. 1916. Pp. 32 each part. Price, $0.35 each part; 6 parts (one year), $2.00; 18 parts (complete), $6.00.

REPORT ON THE ATTENDANCE AT CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES. By the Committee. (*The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, Vol. XII, No. 4—August, 1916.) Published quarterly at 1651 E. Main St., Columbus, Ohio. Pp. 19. Annual individual membership fee, $2.00.

BENÔIT XV ET LE CONFLICT EUROPÉEN. Par M. l'Abbé G. Arnaud d'Agnel, Docteur en Théologie et en Philosophie. Première Série. Tome Premier: A la Lumière de l'Évangile. Pp. 338. Tome Deuxième: A la Lumière de l'Histoire. Pp. 396. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1916. Prix, les 2 volumes, 7 *fr.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

ST. MICHAEL'S ALMANAC FOR 1917. Published for the benefit of the Mission houses and foreign missions of the Society of the Divine Word. Vol. XIX. Mission Press of the Society of the Divine Word, Techny, Ill. Pp. 109. Price, $0.20.

APOSTEL-KALENDER. 1917. Reich illustriert. Gesellschaft des Göttlichen Heilandes, St. Nazianz, Wisconsin. Seiten 128. Preis, $0.25.

THE CATHOLIC MIND. Vol. XIV, No. 18: Pseudo-Scientists vs. Catholics. The Pope and the Children. Scandalizing the Little Ones. Why go to College? The Guardian of Purity. The American Press, New York. 22 September, 1916. Pp. 24. Price, $0.05; $1.00 per year.

THE NEW MORN. English Diplomacy and the Triple Entente. A Phantasmagoria in One Act. By Barrie Americanus Neutralis (Paul Carus). Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. 1916. Pp. 36. Price, $0.50.